



The HISTORICAL BULLETIN

Vol. 31 1952-53

Vol. XXXI, No. 1

November, 1952



Ohio Churches and Abolitionism - - - - 3

Thomas Conry

Medieval Regulations for Health - - - - 17

Dorothy Kmiecinski

Miscellany of Studies in British History - - 36

Thomas L. Coonan

Reviews of Books - - - - - 44

Current Bibliography - - - - - 57

31
1952-53

2nd Edition

SAINT LOUIS UNIVERSITY PRESS

50 cents a copy

Saint Louis 3, Mo.

\$2.00 a year

39521

v.31
1952/
53

The HISTORICAL BULLETIN

A Service Quarterly for Teachers and Students of History

Vol. XXXI

November, 1952

No. 1

Editor

EDWARD R. VOLLMAR

Associate Editor

LOWRIE J. DALY

Editorial Board

John Francis Bannon

Thomas L. Coonan

Jasper W. Cross

Anthony F. Czakowski

Joseph P. Donnelly

Martin F. Hasting

Laurence J. Kenny

Daniel D. McGarry

Thomas P. Neill

Paul G. Steinbicker

Published quarterly in November, January, March and May, by the Department of History, Saint Louis University, Saint Louis 3, Missouri. Entered as second-class matter January 7, 1932, at the Post Office of Saint Louis, Missouri, under the Act of March 3, 1879. Address all communications to THE HISTORICAL BULLETIN, 221 North Grand Blvd., Saint Louis 3, Missouri.

REVIEWS OF BOOKS

A History of the Crusades, v. 1	44
Readings in the History of the Ancient World	45
A History of England	46
Der Josephinismus	48
The Beginnings of Diplomacy	48
Some Modern Historians of Britain	49
Renaissance to Reformation	50
The Amiable Baltimoreans	51
The Growth of the American Economy	53
Here They Once Stood	53
Land of the Conquistadores	55

OHIO CHURCHES AND ABOLITIONISM

THOMAS CONRY*
XAVIER UNIVERSITY

Recent historians who stress the Abolitionist Movement and consequent emotional tension in explaining the causes of the Civil War find strong support for their thesis in the record of Ohio churches and religious groups. It is true that these churches were far from presenting a united front against slavery; in fact, outspoken abolitionists did not constitute a majority of their members. But those who opposed slavery frequently possessed a determination and fanatical zeal which more than compensated for their minority of numbers.

No inhibition imposed by separation of church and state restrained these men from resorting to politics as a tool to implement their views. Thus the *Unity Magazine*, published under Unitarian auspices at Dayton, said of "The Christian Politician:"

He is not the *property of any mere party*. He allows no party to claim him farther than it goes for truth and right * * *. As a believer in the bible, the kingdom of Christ in its advancement and final triumph is paramount to every other consideration. All else is only secondary to this. Civil government itself is looked upon only as a means to this end. With this motive he can vote, legislate, or execute laws for Christ.¹

The same editor on another occasion had some pointed advice for the pulpit:

The question is often asked, what can we do as Christians and friends of the slave? Permit me for once publicly to answer the question. First, let every man that dares call himself an ambassador of Christ throw away that foul and hateful lie that "gospel ministers must not preach politics," for it is pro-slavery trash, and contrary to the Bible. The patriarchs and prophets, Christ and his apostles, all preached politics; the Bible is a political book; but its politics are God's politics, and any nation is politically cursed with any other. Yes, I repeat, for God's sake, for religion's sake, preach against the bloody moloch of American slavery wherever you go, and if you are not honest enough to do so,

¹ *Unity Magazine* (Dayton, Ohio), I (1853), p. 10. Italics in original.

*Father Conry is professor of history at Xavier University in Cincinnati.

give up your license and go to work. And when you preach against slavery, do not be a coward, and go around the crime of voting for man-stealers, but "cry aloud and spare not."²

Abolitionist sentiment in Ohio churches can be traced mostly to two sources: first, the migration of Quakers and others from the South who were opposed to slavery; and second, the agitation of a Presbyterian-Congregationalist group of ministers who studied at Lane Seminary in Cincinnati and at Oberlin College. Puritans who had come from new England to settle especially in the Western Reserve furnished fertile soil for this anti-slavery seed.

Emigrants from South

In the latter part of the eighteenth century many Quakers and Scotch-Irish Presbyterians, after having first settled in Pennsylvania, moved southward into the interior of Virginia, the Carolinas, and Georgia. From about 1800 until approximately 1840 a considerable number of these people undertook further migration which led them into the Old Northwest. Not a few settled permanently in Ohio. It is true of course that economic and social factors, even physical geography, helped to direct this movement. But many of these settlers who came to Ohio brought strong religious convictions against slavery.

This was especially true of the Quakers. The Society of Friends had declared its unalterable opposition to slavery as early as 1688 and could boast by 1787 that there were no slave-owners among its acknowledged members. By 1800 Quakers began leaving the South and moving to the Northwest Territory where slavery had been forbidden by the Ordinance of 1787. While exact statistics regarding this movement are unavailable, the evidence that does exist indicates that the number of people involved was quite high. Several Quaker "meetings" in Virginia were so depleted by these departures that the remnants simply dissolved. In 1800 an entire "meeting" migrated from Jones County in North Carolina to Concord, Ohio. In 1805 some eight hundred families moved from the South to Ohio, settling principally in Belmont County and in the Miami Valley.

This migration of the Friends brought to Ohio several prominent leaders of the later anti-slavery movement. The mother of Edwin Stanton came from Virginia with a Quaker family. Levi

² *Unity Magazine*, I (1854), p. 277.

Coffin, foremost "conductor" of the Underground Railroad in Cincinnati, and James G. Birney, presidential candidate of the Liberty Party in 1840 and 1844, were other abolitionists who came to Ohio with the Quakers.³

Other denominations were also represented in this migration by men who became leading abolitionists. Rev. John Rankin, called "the Martin Luther of the anti-slavery cause," began his ministry in Kentucky, but moved to Ripley, Ohio, where he was pastor of the Presbyterian church from 1822 to 1866 and very active in the Underground Railroad as well as in preaching against slavery.⁴ Rev. Marius Robinson had been a Presbyterian missionary in Alabama before coming to Cincinnati to study in Lane Seminary. After the other seminarians left Lane for Oberlin, Robinson remained in Cincinnati and helped to edit the anti-slavery *Philanthropist*. When the offices of this paper were wrecked by a Queen City mob in 1836, Robinson escaped by disguising himself and mingling with the rioters. He preached against slavery through Ohio, had several more encounters with mobs, and in 1851 became editor of the *Bugle*, an abolitionist organ published at Salem, Ohio. The "higher law" doctrine⁵ was a dominant theme in the columns of the *Bugle*. During the Civil War Robinson gave speeches to recruit volunteers and gathered supplies for the sick and wounded.⁶

Lane Seminary and Oberlin

A second source of abolitionism in Ohio was the student body of Lane Seminary in the early 1830's. Their contribution to the

³ John D. Barnhart, "Sources of Southern Migration into the Old Northwest," *Mississippi Valley Historical Review*, XXII (1935), pp. 49-62; Randolph Downes, *Frontier Ohio, 1788-1803* (Columbus: Ohio State Archaeological and Historical Society, 1935), p. 97; Robert E. Chaddock, *Ohio Before 1850; A Study of the Early Influence of Pennsylvania and Southern Populations in Ohio*, Vol. XXXI of *Columbia University Studies in History, Economics and Public Law* (New York: 1908), pp. 33-36.

⁴ Rev. Elwell O. Meade, "The Underground Railroad of Ohio," *Papers of the Ohio Church History Society*, X, pp. 31-52. Rankin's activity in this enterprise can be studied most effectively by visiting his famous old house in Ripley which is maintained as an historical landmark and museum by the Ohio State Archaeological and Historical Society.

⁵ The significance of this famous expression of William H. Seward and its use as a shibboleth by abolitionists is ably discussed by Rev. Frederick E. Welfle, S.J., "The Higher-Law Controversy," *Mid-America*, X (1939), pp. 185-205.

⁶ Russell B. Nye, "Marius Robinson, A Forgotten Abolitionist Leader," *Ohio Archaeological and Historical Quarterly*, LV (1946), pp. 138-154.

cause has been interestingly told by Gilbert H. Barnes in *The Antislavery Impulse, 1830-1844*. Theodore Dwight Weld, leading character of the famous Lane Seminary group, was a confirmed abolitionist before entering the seminary in Cincinnati. In 1832 he had visited Western Reserve College, then located in Hudson, Ohio, and "converted" several professors of that Congregationalist institution to abolitionism. In a few months a member of the faculty was joyfully telling Weld how the anti-slavery seed was multiplying on the Reserve:

Abolitionists are fast multiplying all over the Reserve. In Claridon, Geauga Co., nearly all the substantial men and all the *young* men have adopted these views * * *. Prof. Green is just sending to the press four of his sermons on the first principles of things in regard to slavery. They will gain a reading in spite of prejudice. Some pungent notes will accompany them.⁷

Shortly after the great debate over abolition at Lane Seminary in the winter of 1834, Weld wrote enthusiastically to his patron, Lewis Tappan of New York, that the seminarians were now implementing their anti-slavery faith with "works:"

We believe that faith without *works* is dead. We have formed a large and efficient organization for elevating the colored people of Cincinnati—have established a Lyceum among them, and lecture three or four times a week on grammar [sic], geography, arithmetic, natural philosophy, etc. Besides this, an evening free school, for teaching them to read, is in operation every week day evening; and we are about establishing one or two more.⁸

Not only did the Lane students teach and preach among the colored people of Cincinnati, but they were soon being assisted in their apostolate by several white ladies. The work of these "Sisters," as they were called, was described in glowing terms by one of Weld's associates at Lane:

The Sisters are doing nobly. They are everywhere receiving with open arms. They visit, eat, and sleep with their [colored] people and are exerting a powerful influence in correcting their domestic habits.⁹

⁷ Elizur Wright, Jr., to Weld, February 1, 1833. Gilbert H. Barnes and Dwight L. Dumond (ed.), *The Weld-Grimke Letters* (2 vols.; American Historical Association, 1934), I, pp. 101-104. Italics in original.

⁸ Weld to Lewis Tappan, March 18, 1834. *Ibid.*, I, pp. 132-135. Italics in original.

⁹ S. Wells to Weld, December 15, 1834. *Ibid.*, I, pp. 178-180.

Meanwhile conservative Cincinnati, already sensitive on the race question as a result of riots in 1830, was showing signs of contempt and anger for the apostolate of the Lane seminarians. "Precocious undergraduates * * * dreaming themselves into full-grown patriots." while they should be minding "their own business and their books," were some of the epithets hurled by the Queen City press. Weld wrote to one editor replying to these charges with some interesting information about the students:

I will give a few statistics of the theological students whose infantile prattlings have so ruffled the equanimity of the reviewer. *Thirty* of the theological class are over twenty-six years old, fourteen are over twenty-eight, and nine are between thirty and thirty-five. Two of the class were members of colleges seventeen years ago; two others graduated eight years since; and the remainder have either graduated more recently, or have gone through a course of study substantially equal to a college course. One of the class was a practicing physician for ten years; twelve others have been public agents for state and national benevolent institutions, employed in public lecturing in various parts of the Union. Six of the class are married men; three of them have been so for nearly ten years.¹⁰

But this effort of Weld to vindicate his Lane Seminary colleagues failed. Alarmed trustees of the seminary forbade any further anti-slavery activity among the students. In fact the Lane authorities were about to expel the irresponsible Weld when they were forestalled by the departure of that abolitionist agitator together with more than fifty other students from the seminary in the early autumn in 1834. Sheltered temporarily in a building provided by the brother-in-law of Salmon P. Chase, the "rebels" were awaiting further developments when Rev. John J. Shipherd, president of Oberlin College, came to Cincinnati to seek funds and recruit a faculty for his hard-pressed little college on the Western Reserve.

Oberlin was a Congregationalist enterprise which united church and state in a land-selling project and other community effort for the benefit of the church and college. But financial problems were threatening to render still-born this brain-child of Shipherd at the time he was listening with interest to an account of developments at Lane Seminary. However, the situation at Lane seemed to offer a possible solution to Shipherd's problems. If the

¹⁰ Weld to James Hall, May 30, 1834. *Ibid.*, I. pp. 137-146. Italics in original.

seminarians would come to Oberlin, and if the Tappan brothers of New York would then direct their philanthropy to Oberlin as they had formerly done for Lane—perhaps Shipherd's dreams of Oberlin College might be realized after all.

The seminarians agreed to come if Oberlin trustees would give the famous New York revivalist, Charles Grandison Finney, a position on the faculty, make Rev. Asa Mahan of Cincinnati president of the college, and admit negro students on the same basis as whites. The Oberlin trustees delayed long over the third condition but finally adopted an ambiguous resolution "that the education of people of color is a matter of great interest and should be encouraged and sustained in this institution."¹¹

Negroes as well as women were admitted to the college classrooms. The Lane seminarians arrived early in 1835, and Oberlin became a center of abolitionist propaganda and a most active "station" of the Underground Railroad. Weld and others went out from Oberlin like the apostles from Jerusalem to preach against slavery. And these evangelists of abolitionism were not deterred by opposition which mounted at times to physical violence.¹²

Their preaching met with a slow but increasing response. By 1839 an Ohio Anti-Slavery Society had been formed; in its meeting at Putnam, Ohio, that year, "a great number of resolutions were passed on the usual topics."¹³ A religious weekly, the *Oberlin Evangelist*, published by the Congregationalists at Oberlin, was encouraging the efforts of abolitionists and noting with satisfaction the progress of their crusade. Late in 1839 the American Anti-Slavery Society gave recognition to the Ohio group by meeting for the first time west of the Alleghenies in the Stone Church in Cleveland where more than three hundred delegates gathered.¹⁴

Abolitionists in Action

Ohio and midwestern abolitionists generally differed from the pattern followed by Garrison and his adherents in that the former soon displayed a penchant for political action. Thus the

¹¹ Wilbur H. Phillips, *Oberlin Colony* (Oberlin Printing Company, 1933), pp. 50-51.

¹² A graphic account of Weld's experiences is found in his letter to Elizur Wright, Jr., March 2, 1835. *Weld-Grimke Letters*, I, pp. 205-208.

¹³ *Oberlin Evangelist*, July 3, 1839.

¹⁴ *ibid.*, November 6, 1839.

meeting at the Stone Church in Cleveland resolved to vote only for candidates who favored immediate abolition. This was the beginning of a fateful development which eventually brought into the politics of Ohio and the nation such uncompromising opponents of slavery as Salmon P. Chase, Joshua Giddings, and Benjamin Wade. When men of this stamp gained the ascendancy compromise was rendered impossible and conflict truly became irrepressible.

A famous political weapon widely used by the abolitionists was the petition to Congress demanding legislation against the domestic slave trade and against slavery in the District of Columbia and territories. Religious groups in Ohio entered enthusiastically upon the project of circulating these petitions. Weld prepared a model for this purpose as early as 1834, and the extent to which it was used is attested by the thousands of copies of this form in the files of the House of Representatives in the Library of Congress.¹⁵ The *Oberlin Evangelist* in 1839 urged its readers to get busy circulating petitions:

Petitions.—It is high time to commence the circulation of petitions to Congress and the several State Legislatures for the abolition of slavery in the D.C. and in the territories, and for the abolition of such local laws as may be injurious to the colored people of any particular state; also for the repeal of the license laws.¹⁶

Another abolitionist project was to assist the escape of slaves. The opponents of slavery approached this phase of their crusade on two fronts: while the abolitionist press denounced Ohio's fugitive slave law individual abolitionists were furnishing direct aid to the escaping slaves through the Underground Railroad. Thus the *Evangelist* in 1839 was virtually applying the "higher law" doctrine to the state fugitive slave law:

These things being so, he that obeys that act is a slave; it forbids him contrary to all the superior laws named, to use his time, his ability, and his property in aiding a poor oppressed fellow being, who has been guilty of no crime, but who is simply seeking the enjoyment of his "inalienable rights." Fellow Citizens of Ohio, will you obey the "Black Act" and be *Slaves*; or will you rather obey the law of Jehovah and other just laws made in pursuance thereof, and be freemen? For myself, although I expect if need be, to submit to its

¹⁵ Weld-Grimke Letters, I, pp. 175-176.

¹⁶ *Oberlin Evangelist*, November 6, 1839.

penalty, yet I consider the statute no more binding than the command of the Jewish priests to the Apostles, that they should speak no more in the name of Jesus; and, if ever called in question with reference to it, my answer will be, "Whether it be right in the sight of God to hearken unto you more than unto God judge ye."¹⁷

A Quaker Meeting in 1848 issued the statement:

But we apprehend the laws of Ohio, in relation to the colored race, are not only incompatible with the precepts and tenor of the gospel, (which we profess to believe and to be governed by,) but with the spirit and principles on which our government is ostensibly founded.¹⁸

Religious groups and ministers were also prominent agents of the Underground Railroad. Rev. John Rankin at Ripley was especially active in aiding the escape of slaves. His house stood on the lofty summit of a hill overlooking the Ohio River and was easily seen from the Kentucky shore. A long stairway which led from the foot of the hill to Rankin's house was known as "Liberty Stairway" from its frequent use by fugitives. It is said that thousands of escaping slaves were sheltered here, including Eliza and George Harris of *Uncle Tom's Cabin*. Rankin was fined one thousand dollars for violating the fugitive slave law, but neither this nor any other consideration ever dissuaded him from his efforts in behalf of the slave.¹⁹

Cincinnati was an important station on the underground route from Kentucky. The Sixth Street Presbyterian Church, formerly presided over by Rev. Asa Mahan who became president of Oberlin College, was one of the places of refuge in the Queen City. There were two rooms under the sanctuary of this edifice which could be reached by ladders through secret doors on each side of the organ, and scores of fugitives were sheltered here.²⁰

Lane Seminary, despite the departure of Weld and his associates, was in 1841 suspected of harboring fugitive slaves and for this reason was threatened with a mob attack. The seminarians, having learned in advance of the plans to attack their school, formed a military company for its defense. Ohio's governor, Thomas Corwin, sent them guns and ammunition from the State Arsenal, and President Lyman Beecher instructed the

¹⁷ *ibid.*, August 14, 1839. Italics in original.

¹⁸ *Western Friend*, I (1848), p. 272.

¹⁹ Meade, *op. cit.*

²⁰ Mary Irene Cooper, "The Career of Rev. Lyman Beecher in Cincinnati" (Unpublished M.A. thesis, Dept. of History, Ohio State U., 1937), p. 42.

students that they could shoot but not to kill. In the face of such resistance, the mob turned back.²¹

Oberlin received "passengers" from at least five converging lines of the Underground Railroad. Signposts were erected a few miles outside the town to direct the fugitives. So notorious did Oberlin become in this respect and in criticism of Ohio laws discriminating against the free negro that the Ohio Legislature several times considered revoking the college charter. As many as three hundred slaves a year were sheltered in Oberlin.²²

In 1858 an armed mob of Oberlin residents forcibly rescued an escaped negro boy from two United States commissioners and an agent of the boy's Kentucky master. The negro was concealed for several days in the home of the Oberlin College president and then taken safely to Canada. Two Protestant ministers, Rev. J. M. Fitch and Rev. Richard Winsor, took part in this mob action and were among the thirty-seven participants in the "rescue" who were indicted by the Federal Grand Jury in Cleveland, December 7, 1858, for violation of the fugitive slave law. The two ministers were not convicted in the trial that followed, but several of their associates were punished with fines of one hundred dollars and twenty days in prison.²³

Religious periodicals in Ohio sharply denounced policies of the Federal Government before the Civil War which seemed to favor the institution of slavery. The Mexican War and Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo were said to make the United States "the strongest supporter of human slavery."²⁴ When the Kansas-Nebraska Bill was in course of passage through Congress, the *Unity Magazine* referred to it as "an infamous bill" and declared that "every Christian in this nation ought to pray for the defeat of this last and boldest demand of slavery."²⁵ In the light of such expressions by the religious press it can hardly be regarded as a coincidence that the convention which formally launched the Republican Party in Ohio at Columbus, July 13, 1855, met in a church.²⁶

²¹ *ibid.*, pp. 48-49.

²² Wilbur H. Siebert, *The Underground Railroad* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1898), pp. 97-98.

²³ Phillips, *op. cit.*, pp. 77-81.

²⁴ *Western Friend*, December 2, 1847, and March 16, 1848.

²⁵ *Unity Magazine*, I, (1854), p. 160.

²⁶ Eugene H. Roseboom and Francis P. Weisenburger, *A History of Ohio* (New York: Prentice-Hall, 1934), p. 245.

Division of Opinion

It should not be inferred, however, that Ohio's churches and religious leaders were unanimous in demanding action against slavery. At no time before the end of the Civil War could this inference have been verified. Many conscientious churchmen had no sympathy with abolitionism, and there was a sharp difference of opinion over slavery—a divergence of views which in several instances caused schisms within Ohio churches.

Thus the course pursued by Methodists relative to this question was in its early phases hesitant and inconsistent. Their Conference at Chillicothe in 1812 ruled that no member might purchase a slave, except out of mercy and with a view to manumission. Such a slave could be held for a period of service only long enough to compensate the buyer, and this procedure was to be under the supervision of the church.²⁷ In 1836, when two Methodists were reported lecturing on "that agitating topic" of abolition in Cincinnati, the General Conference, plainly worried over the possible reaction of this sensitive community, adopted the following resolutions condemning abolitionist agitation:

Whereas, great excitement has pervaded the country on the subject of modern abolitionism, which is reported to have been increased in this city recently, by the unjustifiable conduct of two members of the General Conference, in lecturing upon and in favor of that agitating topic; and whereas, such a course on the part of any of its members is calculated to bring upon this body the suspicions and distrust of the community, and misrepresent its sentiments with regard to the point at issue; and whereas, in this aspect of the case, a due regard for its own character, as well as a just concern for the interest of the church confided to its care, demand a full, decided, and unequivocal expression of the views of the General Conference in the premises; therefore,

Resolved, by the delegates of the annual conferences, in General conference assembled, That they disapprove, in the most unqualified sense, the conduct of two members of the General Conference, who are reported to have lectured in this city recently upon and in favor of modern abolitionism.

Resolved, by the delegates of the annual conferences, in General conference assembled, That they are de-

²⁷ Journal of the Ohio Methodist Conference at Chillicothe, October 1, 1812. William W. Sweet, (ed.), *Circuit-Rider Days Along the Ohio* (Cincinnati: Methodist Book Concern, 1923), pp. 108-109.

cidedly opposed to modern abolitionism, and wholly disdain any right, wish, or intention, to interfere in the civil and political relation between master and slave, as it exists in the slave-holding states of this Union.²⁸

But by 1844 Methodist sentiment regarding slavery was following sectional lines more closely—so closely that they could no longer preserve their national unity. It was at Cincinnati in that year that the General Conference adopted by a vote of 110 to 68 the famous resolution ordering Bishop James O. Andrew of Georgia, who had become a slave-owner by marriage, to “desist from the exercise of his office so long as this impediment remains.”²⁹ Whereupon fifty-one delegates from the South presented a declaration that “the objects and purposes of the Christian ministry cannot be successfully accomplished by them under the jurisdiction of this General Conference as now constituted.”³⁰ The General Conference then proceeded to define the boundary that should prevail between the northern and southern Methodists and to formulate a “plan of separation” for the division of their property.³¹

Ohio Presbyterians also were divided over “that agitating topic.” The Presbytery of Chillicothe in 1835 adopted resolutions condemning slavery as a “heinous sin.”³² But when these resolutions were communicated to the Columbus Presbytery, the latter body replied that it was “not by any means prepared to approve the views and adopt the resolutions communicated by the Presbytery of Chillicothe respecting the exercise of discipline in the case of Slaveholders.”³³

The national organization of the Presbyterian Church in the United States had in 1838 split into the New School and Old School factions. Although in this liberal-conservative cleavage, the New School was more anti-slavery than the Old, nevertheless the line of division did not coincide perfectly with their respective attitudes toward slavery, and there were many Presbyterians in Ohio who wished to go further in condemnation of “the peculiar

²⁸ Published in the Methodist *Western Christian Advocate* (Cincinnati), May 20, 1836.

²⁹ *ibid.*, June 14, 1844.

³⁰ *ibid.*, June 21, 1844.

³¹ *ibid.*

³² Minutes of meeting, Box 1 of Presbyterian Records (MSS), Ohio State Archaeological and Historical Library, Columbus, Ohio.

³³ *ibid.*, Box 4. Records of Columbus Presbytery, Vol. I, p. 252.

institution" than even the New School was willing to countenance. Consequently a third branch of Presbyterianism was formed at Ripley, Ohio, in 1847, by a meeting of ministers and elders from Ripley, Hillsborough, and Mahoning. The new branch, which was known as the "Free Synod of Cincinnati," adopted the following resolutions on the occasion of its formation at Ripley:

Resolved, 1st. That we hereby express and record our devout thanksgiving to Almighty God, that in his adorable providence, after much tribulation, we are permitted to see and take part in constituting a Presbyterian church in the United States, free in all respects, from the sin, the shame, and the dominion of American slavery; thus restoring to some extent, our noble system of doctrine and order to its proper place in the respect and confidence of our countrymen.

2. That as a church of Jesus Christ, and in the name of the most High God, we protest and bear our testimony against the course pursued by the Old and New School General Assemblies, whose jurisdiction we have declined, in regard to the system of slavery in the United States, as calculated to dishonor the Gospel, to bring the church of Christ into contempt, and to open the floodgates of infidelity upon the land.³⁴

Divisions occurred even at lower levels of church organization in Ohio as men began to discuss the subject that would eventually pit brother against brother in armed conflict. One Sabbath in 1846 Rev. Henry Harvey, pastor for many years of the Presbyterian church at Martinsburgh, Ohio, preached a sermon against war, which was occasioned by the opening of hostilities with Mexico. A large part of his congregation thereupon withdrew and established a separate parish which has survived to the present time.³⁵

Miami University at Oxford, Ohio, a state institution, but a Presbyterian stronghold throughout the first half century of its existence, in 1840 dismissed its first president, Rev. Robert Hamilton Bishop, largely because of his anti-slavery views and the abolitionist activities he permitted among the students. Old and New School Presbyterianism were entangled with the slavery question in the complex controversy leading to the dismissal of President Bishop. Bishop, an adherent of the New School, was

³⁴ *Western Friend*, January 13, 1848.

³⁵ William L. Fiske, Jr., "The Scotch-Irish in Central Ohio," *Ohio Archaeological and Historical Quarterly*, LVII (1948), pp. 111-125.

succeeded by Rev. George Junkin, leader of the conservative faction and popularly known as the "heresy hunter." But the orthodoxy of Junkin did not bring peace to Miami; quarrels over religion and slavery continued to disturb the university and seriously retarded its development.³⁶

Catholic Attitude

Although not so deeply concerned and vocal about the slavery question as Protestants, Catholics were not altogether indifferent and silent. Their attitude, as expressed by Cincinnati archdiocesan authorities in the columns of the *Catholic Telegraph*, was opposed to slavery, but not in sympathy with the abolitionist movement. The fact that anti-slavery agitators not infrequently manifested strong nativist sentiment no doubt accounts in part for the relatively conservative position assumed by Catholics.³⁷ But there was also among them a general distrust of legislation as a means of social reform.

The *Catholic Telegraph* denounced the slave trade and rejoiced that "the world is waking up to the horrors, religious, social, and political, of Negro Slavery."³⁸ But the lack of confidence in civil law as an implement of reform was clearly and forcibly expressed in an editorial of 1853:

A large class of men in our times adopted and pertinaciously retain the idea that the world is to be set to rights by legislative enactments. There are, in the first place, the European Red Republicans, who thought that if an assembly would declare Europe to be free, Europe would forthwith be free—forgetting that in the change of tyrants, the tyranny remains.

In the second place, there are the "manifest destiny" men of our country, who think (regardless of the unredressed social oppression they see about them) that if the American flag but waves over a land, that land must be an elysium.

Thirdly, we have the fanatical Abolitionists, who

³⁶ James H. Rodabaugh, "Miami University, Calvinism, and the Anti-Slavery Movement," *Ohio Archaeological and Historical Quarterly*, XLVIII (1939), pp. 66-73. See also the same author's biography of *Robert Hamilton Bishop* (Columbus: Ohio Archaeological and Historical Society, 1935), p. 132ff.

³⁷ For a study of the Catholic position from a nation-wide viewpoint, see Madeleine H. Rice, *American Catholic Opinion in the Slavery Controversy* (Columbia University Press, 1944), *passim*.

³⁸ *Catholic Telegraph*, May 16, 1840, and February 6, 1841.

dream that if Congress should pass a law abolishing slavery, the colored race would cease to be downtrodden * * *.

It is wonderful how men of any logic can be deceived by such patent nonsense. No law can remedy any evil unless it be *obeyed*. No law will be obeyed unless its subjects have a *motive* for obeying it * * *. This motive never can be a legislative enactment, nor a corporal penalty. Corporal penalties are of weight among a people who are reminded by them of the terrible and unerring justice of God * * *. Every reform must commence from the individual. The individual must be taught what is right, and why he ought to do it. And one by one the great majority of the members of society must be "reformed" before the reformation can be written in the statute books.³⁹

In 1861 the *Telegraph* urged Ohio Catholics to remain loyal to the Union and to their state.⁴⁰ But it deprecated coercion of the seceding states.⁴¹ After the war had begun, however, the *Telegraph* told Catholics to "walk shoulder to shoulder with all fellow-citizens in support of the laws and the national honor." Archbishop Purcell ordered a United States flag to be flown from the spire of the Cincinnati cathedral for the duration of the conflict.⁴²

Thus Ohio's churches were deeply interested in the slavery question; some were distracted by it—even torn asunder. One may readily criticize their actions and their solution or lack of solution for the perennial race problem. Certainly they often transgressed the boundary that modern secularist thought defines between church and state. But is impossible to deny early Buck-eye churchman a certain grim importance in American history—an importance that derives from the substantial contribution they made to the Abolitionist Movement and consequently to the coming of the Civil War. Neither should one deny that they had the courage of their convictions.

³⁹ *ibid.*, July 9, 1853. Italics in original.

⁴⁰ *ibid.*, January 26, 1861.

⁴¹ *ibid.*, January 19, 1861.

⁴² *ibid.*, April 20, 1861; Sister Mary Agnes McCann, *Archbishop Purcell and the Archdiocese of Cincinnati* (Catholic University of America, 1918), pp. 77-79.

MEDIEVAL REGULATIONS FOR HEALTH AND SANITATION

DOROTHY KMIECINSKI*
MUNDELEIN COLLEGE

A great difficulty in handling the history of the Middle Ages arises from the fact that there has been a serious misrepresentation of the life and institutions of this period. From the attacks of some Renaissance Humanists,¹ and the Protestant reformers of sixteenth century Europe,² through the bitter invectives of the Encyclopedists of the eighteenth century,³ and the antipathy of the materialists of the nineteenth century,⁴ the medieval world has been assailed. Some twentieth century historians have not been innocent in this respect. Two examples among many are cases in point: at the turn of the century, Henry Lea published four volumes, *A History of the Inquisition in Spain*, a work completely impregnated with subtle antagonism and unfair interpretation of the Inquisition;⁵ more recently, Dr. G. G. Coulton, in his great dislike for the Catholic Church frequently has colored his explanation of data and fact.⁶

The problem of health and sanitation in the Middle Ages has been open to many unfair attacks. In fact, it was not until twenty-five years ago, when medieval scholars, including such men as Dr. Lynn Thorndike, Dr. George Sarton, Dr. James Thompson, Dr. Louis Paetow, and Dr. J. J. Walsh began to interpret the Middle Ages, that a reconsideration of the economic and social life as it was actually lived was begun. Results have been most revealing.

Despite the congestion of his town and the few primitive facilities which he had for ordinary livable conveniences, the

¹ Erasmus, Desiderius, *The Praise of Folly*, tr. by Hoyt H. Hudson, 85-100.

² Lucas, Henry, *The Renaissance and the Reformation*, 437-443.

³ It is commonly known that works by Voltaire, the Abbe Raynal, Rousseau and others abound in such attitudes.

⁴ Gooch, G., *History and Historians in the Nineteenth Century*, 175-185 who discusses Michelet's hatred in his treatment of the Middle Ages in *The History of the French Revolution*.

⁵ Lea, Henry, *A History of the Inquisition in Spain*, II, 385-386.

⁶ Coulton, G. G., *Five Centuries of Religion*, II, 48-64. For a critical analysis of Dr. Coulton see J. J. Walsh, "A Little Knowledge is a Dangerous Thing," *Commonweal*, 29 (April 7, 1939), 666-667.

*This paper was a special research project of Miss Kmiecinski at Mundelein College, Chicago.

medieval citizen was not unaware of the problem which he faced regarding personal and community health and sanitation. That he persistently attempted to solve it, according to the standards which he set up for himself and his community, is provable fact. Convinced of this, I became fascinated with the subject of the medieval attitude and regulations regarding health and sanitation. The lure of the quest was upon me. Investigation of the problem pointed logically to the following considerations: first, how did the medieval townsmen handle personal cleanliness; secondly, how did he meet the problem of contagion from disease and epidemics, i.e. did he have and abide by health standards and regulations; and thirdly, how did he provide for the sanitation of the town.

A wealth of material in medieval European documents ultimately indicated the necessity of limitation. In answering the questions, I shall confine my study to major towns and boroughs of England in the thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth centuries.

That the medieval townsman knew and valued the implications of the scriptural adage, "cleanliness is next to godliness," is evident. That there are examples of flagrant violations in actual practice is fact. But there is, also, adequate proof to show that there was concern for the problem and certainly some practical attempts to solve it. First, as to personal cleanliness, the English townsman on rising in the morning, generally washed his face, hands, and neck. Furthermore, he saw that his hands were washed before and after every meal. Teeth were cleansed with a mixture of myrrh, vinegar, and honey, and rubbed with wooden toothpicks. Late fifteenth-century health manuals clearly state that "one should always retire to one's chamber and clean the teeth after a meal."⁷ According to Pierre Boissonnade, every respectable family kept their own wooden tub for bathing.⁸ A bath was a pleasant, steaming affair of hot herb-scented water in a large wooden tub. But daily bathing, as we know it, was a luxury seldom indulged in. Toilet soap for this purpose was usually made at home, although it could be bought for about four pence a pound. In the fifteenth century, soap recipes, in which rose-leaves, lavender flowers, and the oil of almonds were used, figure prominently. The fact that several towns, notably

⁷ Byrne, M., *Elizabethan Life in Town and Country*, 29.

⁸ *Life and Work in Medieval Europe*, 210.

Coventry⁹ and Bristol¹⁰ grew rich and prosperous during the fourteenth century due to their lucrative soap-making industries may be offered as indirect proof of the medieval Englishmen's regard for cleanliness of person and clothes.

For those who did not have private baths, public bathing was encouraged by the maintenance of facilities in the large towns. Public bath houses in London were situated on the banks of the Thames River. These were called "stews" from the stoves which were used to heat the water for the bath. It is evident, however, that in the course of time some of these public baths tended to degenerate into houses of ill-fame. In 1417 they were ordered closed by a royal proclamation of Henry V.^{11a}

Closely allied with the problem of personal cleanliness is the corollary of disease. Documents are rich in regulations concerning various types of disease which plagued the medieval world and so frequently decimated populations. Most dreaded of all was the disease possibly inherited from ancient times—the curse of leprosy. In very early documents we read of leprosy but the only sanitary safeguard against it was simple isolation and ejection from the town. Recent scholarship holds that many of the so-called cases of leprosy were simply various kinds of skin disease or skin cancer.^{11b} Leprosy was commonly supposed to come from bad food, semi-putrid fish or flesh. In medieval times, when fresh food was not to be had during many months of the year, and salted foods were often poorly cured owing to the scarcity of salt and its unrefined quality, it is easy to understand that individuals here and there among the English contracted leprosy or other skin diseases. Although leprosy was not in general a disease that anyone might wish to be credited with, yet casual references in the documents do reveal a very interesting sidelight on the problem. There were circumstances when the diagnosis of leprosy had its advantages. It was of use to a beggar or tramp to be called a leper, for he would thus excite more pity and could solicit alms, under royal privilege, although begging was ordinarily punishable.¹²

⁹ Harris, Mary, *The Story of Coventry*, 61.

¹⁰ Andrews, William, *Old English Towns*, 263.

^{11a} *Memorials of London and London Life in the XIII, XIV, and XV Centuries*, ed. by H. Riley, 647-648. Hereafter, this work will be referred to as *Memorials of London*.

^{11b} Creighton, Charles, *A History of Epidemics in Britain*, I, 88-99.

¹² *Ibid.*, 100.

The right to expel lepers from the town was acknowledged long before it was legally enforced. An entry upon the statute-book may be merely the official recognition of long-established custom. English civil law set its seal upon the theory of infection by the writ *De Leproso Amovendo* passed in the beginning of the thirteenth century, and authorizing the expulsion of lepers "on account of manifest peril by contagion."¹³ But legislation was chiefly local not national. The *Assizes* of London for 1276 proclaimed that "no leper shall be going about in the city, or shall make any sojourn in the city, by night or by day, under pain of imprisonment."¹⁴ This measure was supplemented by the Royal Edict of Edward III in 1346, which declared that any person who was leprous must leave the city within fifteen days.¹⁵ Again, twenty-three years later, in 1369, a precept was issued stating: "that no leper may beg in the streets for fear of spreading infection." The porters of the eight principal gates of London when taking the oath of their office, swore to refuse admittance to lepers.¹⁶

As in London, so in other towns, the problem of the leper prevailed. The *Customs* of Bristol written by the town recorder in 1344 declares: "that in the future no leper shall reside within the precincts of the town." Imprisonment was the penalty—a policy of doubtful wisdom. The burgesses of Berwick-on-Tweed decreed: "No leper shall come within the gates of the borough, and if one gets in by chance, the sergeant shall put him out at once * * * for we have taken care that a proper place for lepers shall be kept up outside the town, and that alms shall be there given to them."¹⁷ This evidently points to the existence of the *Leprosarium*.

There is ample evidence in municipal documents to show that lepers dwelling in the towns were expelled. According to the *Court Rolls* of Winchester City, one Roger Cappere was found leprous and was to be removed by the sergeant within a week.¹⁸ In the *Memorials of London*, again, we read of a baker, John

¹³ Clay, Rotha, *The Medieval Hospitals of England*, 52.

¹⁴ *Liber Albus: The White Book of the City of London*, tr. by H. Riley, 238. Hereafter, this work will be referred to as, *Liber Albus*.

¹⁵ *Memorials of London*, 230-231.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 384.

¹⁷ Clay, R., *op. cit.*, 54.

¹⁸ Furley, John, *Town Life in the XIV Century: As Seen in the Court Rolls of Winchester City*, 139.

Mayn, "who was to depart from the city seeing that he was smitten with the blemish of leprosy, and warned not to return on pain of undergoing the punishment of the pillory."¹⁹

While expulsion may have seemed an extremely harsh treatment, it must be remembered that most of the towns supported leper hospitals or lazar-houses, as they were called, outside the city walls. It is important to note that at no time during the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries were these hospitals overcrowded. Statistics here are revealing: we find mention of six lepers at St. Albans, twelve at St. James, and less than forty at St. Giles which was the largest lazar-house in the London vicinity.²⁰ Granted that this is no proof that lepers were not at large among the population, it does argue that the townsmen were concerned with the problem.

From these documents certain conclusions may be drawn, it would seem, with a commendable degree of accuracy: first, the disease was prevalent from the eleventh to the thirteenth century, when it abated; secondly, it was inconsiderable after the beginning of the fourteenth century; and thirdly, it died out almost completely by the end of the fifteenth century. Clearly, the remedy of the townsmen—that is, isolation, had been effective to a certain degree. Dr. Thorndike confirms this.

One of the principal events of the Middle Ages, which was to have a tremendous effect in many ways on town sanitation, was the great plague, later referred to as the Black Death. Doctors are now agreed that this was the bubonic plague which began in China, spread to Constantinople, from there was carried by the trading ships to the Italian cities. From Italy the plague swept Europe reaching England in the Fall of 1348.²¹ The germ of this epidemic was carried by the rat flea. Seemingly, the congestion of the towns offered fertile field for its spread. The symptoms, as indicated in treatises on the disease, were definitely established: gangrenous inflammation of the throat and lungs, chest pains and pestilential odor, followed generally by carbuncles and glandular swellings which broke out under the arms and in the groins. Medieval medicine, still in its infancy, was naturally powerless to diagnose a condition resulting from an organism

¹⁹ *Idem.*, 365.

²⁰ *Social England*, ed. by H. D. Traill, and J. S. Mann, I, 368-369.

²¹ Creighton, C., *op. cit.*, 117.

which can be detected only by microscopic observation. Ignorance, attributed the plague to planetary influences, or better still, to God's anger against the vice and wickedness of the age.

While contemporary accounts of the number of deaths during the plague are too uncertain to be relied upon absolutely, it is safe to estimate that one-third of the population of London died in 1348-9. The increase in the number of wills during this year, gives some indication of the great and abnormal increase in deaths. Recurrences of the plague in lesser degrees and intensity occurred in 1369, 1382, 1390, and 1407, so that through the whole of this half century, the townsmen lived, as it were, under the shadow of this terror.

For the historian the logical question arises, "just exactly what regulation and laws were issued by the English towns to alleviate conditions and to stem the spread of the plague." The first plague order which I have been able to find, whose text is extant, was issued during a plague in 1543. The regulations are:

All streets and lanes within the wards should be cleansed. The cross of St. Anthony should be placed on the door of every house afflicted with the plague and there remain for forty days. That every person whose house has been infected should after a visitation, carry all the straw and clothing of the afflicted in the night privately to the fields to be burned. That all persons having dogs in their house should cause them to be killed and carried out to the city and burned at the common laystall, i.e. rubbish heap."²²

These are just a few of the provisions issued to combat the plague of 1543. No similar regulations for the Black Death of 1348-9 are known, as far as I could ascertain. One must not conclude, however, that none were observed or ever written. Since every large city on the Continent—Italian, French, and German—had provisions which combated the plague, it would only seem reasonable that a prosperous city like London must have had similar regulations. One law on the *Statute Books* of England is an order of Edward III in 1349 to the mayor of London; after protesting the filthy conditions of the city, he commands London and the suburbs to be thoroughly cleansed and "kept clean as of old."²³ One may reasonably argue that this

²² Creighton, C., *op. cit.*, 313-314. Dr. Creighton quotes here from a manuscript entitled, *The Abstract of Several Orders Relating to the Plague*.

²³ Sabine, Ernest, "City Cleaning in Medieval London," *Speculum*, XII (1937), 27.

filthy and obnoxious state could have been due to a collapse of the city-cleaning machinery, brought on by the ravages of the plague. This ordinance may also indicate that importance was placed on improving city sanitation as a means of halting the spread of the plague. However, even under the most perfect conditions of cleanliness, the compactness and congestion of the medieval towns, and the almost complete lack of knowledge of medicine and science, were factors which of their very nature enabled the plague to run its course.

Allied with cleanliness and disease prevention is the problem of food sanitation. The quality of food sold in a medieval town was not only regulated by city ordinances, but more particularly, supervised by the individual guilds. From the very beginning of the towns, the merchants and tradespeople formed themselves into guilds. The merchants' guild, as Dr. Gross in his *Gild Merchant* clearly distinguishes, united all trade in a city; as the members of each craft increased in number they tended to form separate guilds, which were principally, although not exclusively, concerned with maintaining a high standard of work in the specific craft. Certain officials were appointed to examine the work produced by the townsmen in their shops; fines were inflicted for the use of materials or for products which came below standard.

Regulations and provisions applied to the food guilds lend emphasis to the thesis that the medieval townsman was concerned with health and sanitation problems. Statutes of the ale-makers are a case in point. Malt liquids have been from time immemorial the national drink of England; but the ale of medieval times was quite different from the liquor which now passes under the name of English ale or beer. In the first place it contained no hops, and was a sweet drink of the consistency of barley water. It must be borne in mind that it was drunk at all times, taking the place not only of such modern beverages as tea and coffee, but also of water. When a public brewer had made a fresh brew of ale, he had to send for the "ale-conners" or ale-tasters, who were officially appointed by the guild; or to signify that the inspectors' services were required by putting out in front of his house an "ale-stake," a pole with a bunch of leaves at the end; this stake later became in England a universal sign for taverns. No ale might be sold until it had been tasted and approved by the ale-conner. If the ale was of poor quality, the whole brew would be forfeited. If the inspector found the ale fit for consump-

tion, but not of full quality, he would fix a low price at which it might be sold.²⁴ To insure the purity of the ale, not only was the finished product examined, but care was taken to prevent the use of impure water. Rules were laid down governing the actual brewing: the malt used must be "clene, swete, and drye, and wele made;" no brewer was to use wete malte, malte which was overheated, swollen or weavil eaten."²⁵ Every town in England, from London, through Bristol, Coventry, Chester, Nottingham, to the smallest boroughs, such as Salisbury²⁶ and Berwick-on-Tweed, all had their ale-tasters—a vitally important medieval personality whose responsibility was to safeguard the purity of England's typical, national drink.

The making of bread was as carefully regulated as that of ale. The baker's guild was equally solicitous for the welfare of the consumer. Woe betide the baker who sold bread deficient in weight or quality! In London, for the first offence he was drawn on a hurdle from the Guildhall through the principal streets; from his neck hung the fraudulent loaf of bread. That he further underwent several hour's exposure in the pillory is evident in the case of Alan de Lyndeseye which Riley quotes in *The Memorials*.²⁷ If an incorrigible baker committed a similar offence three times, the hurdle was again requisitioned, but public patience being exhausted, his oven was demolished and he was forced to adjure his trade as baker in the city forever.²⁸

Another typical illustration can be drawn from the grocer's guild, who were wholesale sellers in gross. A discussion of merely one of their regulations will suffice for an adequate insight into the extent of their supervision. In 1393, a new ordinance prescribed that all spices, before being sold, should be garbled, this is, sifted by an official garbler, and "that anyone selling spices before having them so cleansed should upon conviction, forfeit of pure and cleaned merchandise to the city Chamber double the weight of such powder and dirt as had been found in them."²⁹ This same source known as *The Calendar of Letter-Books from the Mayor and Corporation of the City of London* also mentions a

²⁴ *Liber Albus*, 360.

²⁵ Salzman, L., *English Industries of the Middle Ages*, 292.

²⁶ *Idem.*, 291.

²⁷ *Idem.*, 120.

²⁸ Snell, F., *The Customs of Old England*, 217.

²⁹ *Calendar of Letters from the Mayor and Corporation of the City of London*, ed. by Reginald Sharpe, [Listed as *Letter-Book H*], 400.

punishment in the following year of a certain grocer for selling adulterated spices (in quantity) to a foreign merchant. He was set in the pillory and had the false powder burnt under him—a much more severe punishment than that actually prescribed by the ordinance.³⁰ Clearly, the grocer's organization was earnestly trying to ensure honest dealings on the part of its members to the citizens of London. Granted that the direct purpose of such a regulation was to maintain the integrity of the craft, indirectly, adulterated foods and drinks concern a health program.

The last guild which I would like to consider in this regard is that of the butchers. Again, according to the London *Letter-Books*, even before the year 1300, masters of the butchers were regularly appointed to supervise all trade activities of each of the three city butcheries—that of St. Nicholas Shambles, of the Stocks Market, and of East Cheap. In 1302 an ordinance required at least two of the masters to be present each time at the butchering of animals. In general, regulations were enforced prescribing times and places for the sale of butcher's meat. These, on the one hand, prevented the butchers from overcrowding certain streets with their stalls, and on the other hand, prevented them from fraudulently selling any meat in secret, which had escaped the supervision of the masters. The major aim, apart from the control of prices, was evidently to enable the masters to see that the quality of meat and the cuts sold were up to required standards.³¹ Ordinance No. 41 of the Guild Merchant of the borough of Southampton in 1300, provided that "no butcher or cook shall sell to any man other than wholesome and clean provisions; if a butcher violate this order, he shall be put in the pillory for an hour of the day or give two shillings to the town."³² Two shillings was actually a very heavy fine, when one considers that the townsmen at this time were making on the average only four or five pence a day.

Evidence abounds to show that the regulations governing the sale of meat, and of foods in general, were rigorously and uniformly strict in insisting on the sale of pure, wholesome products. That the rules were violated at times cannot be denied, but this

³⁰ *Idem.*, 406-407.

³¹ Sabine, Ernest, "Butchering in Medieval London," *Speculum*, VIII (1933), 335-336.

³² Cf. Davies, Rev. J. Silvester, *A History of Southampton*, 145. Rev. Davies quotes here original ordinances of the Guild Merchant.

merely proves, by their swift and severe punishments, that the officials of both the town and the guilds were diligently working for efficiency in trade and health sanitation.

One of the greatest problems of the townsman, as well as the lord of the castle, as it is today to a certain extent, was that of securing the city's water supply. Until the latter part of the thirteenth century, the entire water supply of London was obtained from the Thames and the local springs and wells. Some houses contained a private well; for the others, public wells were sunk in the streets for the use of the general public. There were also various springs within the walls of the city over which charitably disposed persons would from time to time erect conduits, so that the poor could obtain water free of charge. Richard Whittington is credited with several such enterprises. The first water supply ever brought into the city from outside was in the thirteenth century when the Great Conduit or water-main was built in the heart of London.³³ Leaden pipes were laid under ground all the way from the springs at Tyburn which were granted to the city in 1237—a stupendous undertaking for those times. The Conduit was considered such a great wonder, that the citizens, in their pride at such an achievement, caused it to be built in the most handsome style of crenellated stone-work, within which was the leaden cistern which held the water. Officials were appointed to take charge of it, to hold the keys and to control allowances of water. Besides the Great Conduit, nine other smaller ones were built by the end of the fifteenth century. These conduits, maintained in all the major towns, supplied the citizens with pure, fresh water for cooking purposes.³⁴

An interesting index to the attitudes towards sanitation is seen in the policy of a municipal government to keep its streets clean and free from contaminating materials. That medieval town officials faced a tremendous task here is evident from the very physical make-up of the medieval town. The walls and the style of architecture of the houses gave the medieval town a unique and interesting appearance. Barbarian invasions and constant feuds between the warring barons and their neighbors in the early Middle Ages made it necessary for the townsman to protect himself by means of walls. Since space had to be economized, the streets were generally narrow, although the

³³ Pendrill, Charles, *Wanderings in Medieval London*, 165.

³⁴ *Idem.*, 167-168.

main thoroughfares in London, contrary to common opinion, were quite broad, well built, and picturesque.³⁵ The houses, usually two or three stories high, were constructed in such a way, that each upper story jutted out for some distance beyond the one below it, so that the highest stories on each side almost met over the street. Space within the walls was so valuable that little provision could be made for parks, or gardens. While this is true of many towns on the continent, London seems to be an exception. Not only did it have large open fields outside the city, where the citizens could take their walks in the summer and conduct their sports; but according to Charles Pendrill and other writers who support him, there were many large open spaces within the city walls. The Grey Friars, Black Friars, the Carmelites, and the monastery of Holy Trinity, all possessed grounds of considerable extent on which grew a variety of fruits, including cherries, pears, peaches, apples and so forth. Many houses of the merchants were similarly equipped with large and well-laid out gardens, with bowling-alleys and pavilions. The Guildhall of London itself possessed two gardens, a greater and a lesser, which sometimes went by the proud title of "the garden of the city."³⁶ Charles Pendrill lamenting the industrial progress of his day declares:

Departed, indeed, are the glories of Old London. Gone are the sweet smelling herb gardens, the fruit trees loaded with the weight of blossoms in the spring, and without the walls, the farms, hayfields, and pastures, all sacrificed to modern progress.³⁷

One of the worst accusations made against the towns, by otherwise reliable historians of the Middle Ages is the statement that the streets of the medieval towns were constantly foul-smelling and full of filth owing to the failure of municipal authorities to clean them, and that these dirty, pestilence-breeding living conditions in the crowded towns were accompanied by a complete lack of anything resembling civic sanitary legislation. In this broad, general, sweeping statement, it would appear that all medieval towns, regardless of the century or country, could be thus labeled. Such generalizations do not stand the test of scholarly investigation and research.

³⁵ Besant, Walter, *London*, 126.

³⁶ Pendrill, C., *op. cit.*, 194, 196-197.

³⁷ *Idem.*, 206.

A cursory examination of the *Letter-Books*, the principal source of information for London, reveal not a few instances of obnoxious filth, which according to many and to modern standards, are incontrovertible evidence that medieval London was extremely unsanitary. Yet such a sampling of data is not sufficient to give more than a broad and indeed quite hazy impression concerning medieval-town conditions. It does not distinguish the various sections of the town, as to degrees of cleanliness, nor does it in any way attempt to trace through the centuries advances that were made in various phases of city cleaning. Indeed, it leaves one in almost complete ignorance of the actual efforts made by London citizens and officials in coping with this problem.

The burden of responsibility for paving and repairing the streets in early medieval towns fell completely upon the individual householder. According to civic and municipal legislation, the larger towns in England, including London,³⁸ Hull,³⁹ Southampton,⁴⁰ and Worcester,⁴¹ by the thirteenth century, had laws which required each citizen to pave in front of his house as far as the middle of the street. Roughly from the accession of Edward I in 1272, certain town governments began to seek powers from the Crown to supersede the royal government in the actual execution of repairs along the main thoroughfares. Officials and workmen who specialized in the craft of paving begin to appear in the manuscripts. Special arrangements had to be made for the paving of the market square, the space outside the Guild Hall, around the stocks and pillory, and often the actual entries into the town just inside and outside the gates. These spots in most towns were the property of the City Corporation, and had always been under the direct care of the body. This responsible town organization had to meet the expense of paving these sections, for which purpose, the towns levied a tax called "pavage" on various types of merchandise entering the precincts. This toll was directed against the "foreigner" mainly and was granted by the crown for a fixed term of years. An early Northampton grant made by *Letters Patent* of Edward I allowed the levy of pavage on all kinds of merchandise entering the town for sale for two years, beginning in August, 1285. Cambridge in

³⁸ Munro, Dana, *The Middle Ages*, 343.

³⁹ Andrews, W., *op. cit.*, 174.

⁴⁰ Davies, J., *op. cit.*, 120.

⁴¹ Smith, T., *English Guilds, Ordinances of the Guild Merchant of Worcester*, ordinance XX, 384.

1289 obtained a grant for six years, while Coventry in 1285 received a grant for three years.⁴² It was through this limited channel, where the town raised money and hired labor for paving, that local governments came to assume responsibility for paving all the main streets, and occasionally an entire street-system, as in the case of Bristol in 1491, when the whole town seems to have been newly paved.⁴³

The plan of road paving and repairing together with the purchase of materials and employment of workmen, was left to differently named officials in different towns. By 1280 in London, each alderman in his particular ward was to elect: "four reputable men, normally residing in the town, to keep the pavements; and that these four [men] cause the same to be repaired, put down or raised as they shall see fit, and that they be empowered to levy distress." Besides employing town paviours, as the street paving specialists began to be called, by the fifteenth century, London had a "Stone Master" who was finally responsible for the cleansing and for the repairing of roads. In 1475 London citizens were only expected to mend the narrow footway in front of their houses. This may have held good in even the side streets, but it was a practice that extended very rarely to other cities and towns. By 1482 the city of Southampton definitely had a street specialist, a town paviour. A law of this year states: "that a paviour be ordered to dwell in a house of the town, price of thirteen shillings, four pence, rent free, and to have yearly a gown to this intent that he shall with a sergeant of the same town do search the pavement of the said town, and also to pave in all places needful within the said town and do all things that belongeth to that office."⁴⁴ The town paviour in Southampton remained an institution until 1769 when a new paving system was initiated. The Records of Nottingham also show that here was employed a paviour who was paid from the money collected by a toll on certain articles coming into the city for sale in the market.⁴⁵

The status and skill of paviours varied greatly from town to town, but on the whole they were men capably trained in their craft. In 1315, the paviours employed in London had as yet not

⁴² Salusbury-Jones, G., *Street Life in Medieval England*, 19-20.

⁴³ Green, J., *Town Life in the Fifteenth Century*, I, 19.

⁴⁴ Davies, J., *loc. cit.*

⁴⁵ Green, J., *op. cit.*, 142.

organized themselves into a guild, for when it was desired to repair the pavement of the streets in that year, six paviours were elected by an assembly of masons summoned before the Mayor.⁴⁶ Eventually, by 1479, the paviours of London had formed a guild and were properly directed.

One looks in vain in the early London records, prior to the thirteenth century for any clear-cut statement as to the machinery set up for city cleaning, not because such machinery was lacking, but because, as incidental references in the records show, it had long been established, not by written law, but by ancient custom. Moreover it is also evident that from early times, city cleaning was carried on largely under supervision of the various wardmotes, i.e. meetings held in the various city wards. Unfortunately the records of these wardmotes, replete with information as to city cleaning, have survived only in a few minor fragments. Elsewhere, however, considerable information is to be found, since, from the thirteenth century to the seventeenth, regulations based on ancient customs, together with newly enacted laws, were of necessity gradually put into written form in the permanent files of the city. The first carefully organized written statement of city-cleaning regulations seems to have been the *Statute of the Streets* probably enacted about the beginning of the seventeenth century, which post dates by several centuries my period under discussion. It was necessary, therefore, in order to gain a reasonably adequate idea of city cleaning in London for the late middle ages, not only to piece together many separate fragmentary statements, but also to make clear the implications of numerous incidental references.

Certain it is that London had set up in the thirteenth century an extensive organization to take care of city-street cleaning. The king, as the chief executive of the country, could and at times, did, coerce the city in matters of municipal cleaning by writing the mayor and the city council, as did Edward III in 1357, forcing them to action under penalty of fine.⁴⁷

But the mayor, the aldermen, and the common council, working as a unit, planned and organized usually the method of procedure. They decided what officials should be appointed for the purpose; what tolls, as in the case of pavage; what taxes would be imposed to pay for the work. On the other hand, they determined what city cleaning should be left to the citizens them-

⁴⁶ *Liber Albus*, 243.

⁴⁷ *Memorials of London*, 295-296.

selves; and what fines should be imposed for negligence. One notes according to a law of 1297, that every citizen in London was responsible for cleaning the street in front of his house.⁴⁸ The sheriffs (who would correspond to our local judges) were connected with city cleaning only in the most general way: it was their duty to enforce observation of city-cleaning ordinances. The aldermen, on the other hand, as heads of the separate wards, had more specialized duties than the other officials previously mentioned. They levied assessments for the necessary funds; they summoned the wardmotes for election of rakers; they appointed collectors of tolls, and they charged scavengers, beadles and rakers to see to the cleaning of the streets and lanes.⁴⁹

An important first official immediately connected with city cleaning was the scavenger. He acted as overseer, supervising the cleaning of the streets by the rakers. Next, came the surveyors of pavements, four for each ward, chosen from the time of Edward I by the aldermen at the ward meetings. Their duties, as we see from the oath they took, were practically the same as those of the scavengers in respect to city cleanliness: "to preserve, lower and raise the pavements and to remove all nuisances of filth."⁵⁰ The rakers, the forerunners of modern street cleaners, gathered the rubbish from the streets and lanes and carted it either to certain places outside the city limits assigned by the authorities, or else to places on the banks of the Thames from where the dungboats would carry it away.⁵¹ There is, furthermore, ample evidence to show that the rakers worked regularly at their tasks. In 1332, a certain man was arrested, fined, and imprisoned for assaulting a raker of Cripplegate Ward, and taking his cart away from him when he was performing his duty of street cleaning.⁵²

The beadles, who might be compared to our policemen, also had specific duties. They had to levy dues or customs; to warn people to observe the ordinances, and to collect fines from the negligent and distress from those unwilling to pay; they also had the power to arrest those hindering them in their duties.⁵³

⁴⁸ *Idem.*, 35.

⁴⁹ Sabine, Ernest, "City Cleaning in Medieval London," *Speculum*, XII (1937), 21.

⁵⁰ *Liber Albus*, 272.

⁵¹ *Memorials of London*, 298-299.

⁵² Sabine, E., *op. cit.*, 30.

⁵³ *Liber Albus*, *loc. cit.*

In 1364, for example, two women on separate charges were arrested for throwing refuse from their houses into the street, and then abusing the alderman when he protested.⁵⁴ From the time of Edward I until at least 1345 the number of constables commonly appointed to assist each beadle seems to have been not more than two; but in later years a larger number was appointed for certain wards. Thus in 1372, the number of constables for each ward in London ranged all the way from two for seven of the wards, up to eight for three wards.⁵⁵

What was provided in London was proportionally duplicated in other towns. Coventry, Winchester,⁵⁶ Southampton,⁵⁷ Worcester,⁵⁸ and York,⁵⁹ just to mention a few, had laws which made their citizens responsible for keeping the streets clean in front of their houses upon payment of a fine. In Coventry, at the end of the fourteenth century, every Sunday afternoon and Monday morning the sergeant and crier would go through the town and collect a fine of twelve pence from any citizen who had garbage or rubbish in front of his house.⁶⁰ In the *Coventry Leet Book* for 1452 we read: "It is ordered that William Oteley, who keepeth a cart and horses for cleansing of the streets, should have quarterly of every hall door one penny, and every shop likewise."⁶¹ Thus, it is clear from this ruling that the people were paying four pence a year to one of their fellow citizens, who held the position of raker, so that he could gather and cart their garbage to the city dumps. Southampton, likewise, had a similar regulation, however, it is apparent that here more than one scavenger, or town cleaner, were employed although the number is not given.⁶²

While these cleaning systems are obviously not as extensive as that of London, it can be explained by the vast differences in population. At the end of the fourteenth century, London had some 44,000 adult citizens, while Coventry had a total of 4817,

⁵⁴ Sabine, Ernest, "City Cleaning in Medieval London," *Speculum*, XII (1937), 26.

⁵⁵ *Idem.*, 23.

⁵⁶ Furley, John, *op. cit.*, 64.

⁵⁷ Davies, J., *op. cit.*, 45.

⁵⁸ Smith, T., *loc. cit.*

⁵⁹ *York Civic Records*, ed. by A. Raine, 113.

⁶⁰ *The Coventry Leet Book*, ed. by Mary Harris, 23.

⁶¹ p. 273.

⁶² Davies, J., *op. cit.*, 124.

and Southampton, a little over 1000 citizens.⁶³ With these relatively small populations, extensive city-cleaning machinery was not needed.

While these regulations have pertained specifically to street cleaning, many general sanitary ordinances are to be found. It would seem only natural that there were laws forbidding any person from leaving garbage or dung in front of his house,⁶⁴ from throwing it out of a window into the street,⁶⁵ or throwing it into the Thames River.⁶⁶ No laystalls were allowed within the city wall;⁶⁷ no one was to bathe in the Thames;⁶⁸ while poulterers were forbidden to pluck poultry in the highway.⁶⁹

Prior to the thirteenth century, swine and other domestic animals were allowed to roam about the streets of London and other medieval towns. But with greater stress placed on improving sanitary conditions at the close of this century, a law was passed in 1281 prohibiting the wandering of swine in the streets and highways of London.⁷⁰ A few years later, the people were further forbidden to rear swine, oxen, or cows within their houses under pain of forfeiture and fine.⁷¹ Supplementing the above regulations, an ordinance was issued in 1292, which named four men who had just been elected by the city officials for the purpose of killing such swine as they found wandering in the King's highway or the city streets.⁷² Other towns provided for similar regulations. Ordinance No. 56 of the town of Worcester reads: "That no manner person within the said city, have, neither suffer any swine going at large in anoyance or grievance of his neighbor or any citizen * * * upon payment of a fine of eleven pence."⁷³ Ordinance No. 43 of Southampton issued in 1300 provides the same restrictions,⁷⁴ as does a law of Coventry.⁷⁵ In the latter city, however, twenty-one years later, the keeping of pigs within the city

⁶³ Creighton, C., *op. cit.*, 201.

⁶⁴ *Memorials of London*, 290.

⁶⁵ *Idem.*, 389.

⁶⁶ *Idem.*, 367-368.

⁶⁷ *Idem.*, 338.

⁶⁸ *Idem.*, 261.

⁶⁹ Sabine, E., "City Cleaning in Medieval London," *Speculum*, XII (1937), 25.

⁷⁰ *Liber Albus*, 236.

⁷¹ *Idem.*, 289.

⁷² *Memorials of London*, 28.

⁷³ Smith, T., *op. cit.*, 398.

⁷⁴ Davies, J., *op. cit.*, 145.

limits was completely outlawed.⁷⁶ Clearly it is evident, that with these improved conditions, greater strides were made toward a higher standard of city sanitation.

Another tremendous problem, which the Londoner of the Middle Ages, squarely recognized and desperately sought to provide some solution for, was that of the disposal of butchers' waste materials. After slaughtering animals at the two scalding houses, one located at the Stocks Market, and another at St. Nicholas Shambles, the butchers carted the remaining offal and entrails through the streets to the Thames where this waste material was thrown into the river. The citizens complained to such an extent of the blood dripping in the streets, and the stench which defiled the air, that Edward III in 1369 ordered all slaughtering to be done outside the city limits.⁷⁷ No change in this regulation was made until twenty-three years later when the people of London petitioned parliament asking that the butchers might be given a place within the city, because the price of meat had risen so high. In that year a new scalding house for the butchers was built on the banks of the Thames and provisions were made whereby the butchers must cut up their offal into small pieces, take it in boats to mid-stream and cast it into the water at ebb-tide.⁷⁸ Surely this procedure was incomparably better than the old custom of casting uncut offal into the water from the piers along the shore. The Thames at London is of goodly width and the tide is swift, so that the observance of the ordinance for casting the filth into the center of the stream should have made a complete clearanec of it down the river. While these regulations provided a gradual improvement of the situation, a completely adequate solution was impossible at this time. One must not think of Chicago's modern meatpacking houses, making all waste meat-scrap into poultry feed, of modern sterilization of filth, of modern incinerators for burning unusable waste, or even of modern underground and stench-proof sewerage systems; all such things were centuries beyond the horizon of the medieval Londoner.

Assuredly if the medieval town is to be judged according to modern standards of cleanliness and sanitation, it will be found

⁷⁵ *Coventry Leet Book*, 27.

⁷⁶ *Coventry Leet Book*, 217.

⁷⁷ *Memorials of London*, 340.

⁷⁸ Sabine, E., "Butchering in Medieval London," *Speculum*, VIII(1933) 349.

woefully deficient; but, if it is to be judged according to its own aims and ideals of cleanliness, it may surprisingly be found not so gravely negligent. The accusation that all English medieval towns were unnecessarily filthy and unsanitary, owing to a lack of civic sanitary legislation is misleading. Indeed, such a generalization has led to grave misinterpretation and unjust depreciation of the zealous civic spirit often active in many medieval towns for the improvement of sanitary conditions. I have tried to give a better understanding and appreciation of that spirit through an analysis of the available data, taking into account the actual difficulties in the way of achieving improved sanitary conditions, and the actual success in coping with them.

Conclusions drawn from this essay may be summarized as follows: first, soap and baths were known and utilized to an appreciable extent. The frequency of bathing, however, is doubtful, but it must be kept in mind that even today in England, weekly baths are the custom, possibly due to that country's damp, rainy weather. Secondly, the medieval townsmen's solution to leprosy—that of isolation in the lazar-houses—checked the spread of the disease so that by the fifteenth century it seems to be under control. Thirdly, in the mind of the English citizen, as in the minds of most people today, the presence of obnoxious filth was associated with the danger of contagion and the spread of disease. Although powerless to stem the ravages of the Black Death due to lack of the scientific and medical "miracles," the townsman stubbornly fought the plague as best he could. Fourthly, the last half of the fourteenth century witnessed an enormous increase in civic sanitary legislation on the town statute-books. This legislation was concerned primarily with provisions for adequate street cleaning. That there were violations and nuisances cannot be denied, but it is equally certain that they were not condoned. It must be remembered that the complaints which have come down to us from the Middle Ages regarding filthy streets are applicable to abuses rather than to the normal conditions. These complaints testify to the desire in public opinion of far higher standards in such matters.

A MISCELLANY OF RECENT STUDIES IN BRITISH HISTORY

THOMAS L. COONAN*
SAINT LOUIS UNIVERSITY

In the preface to his *History and Origins of Druidism*¹ Louis Spence, author of many books on mythology and ancient folklore, lays down the challenge that the whole Druidic question, an important one in the history of early comparative religion, has become "the bane of the official historian and archeologist" because of "the absurd theories and fantastic assumptions" concerning it, which have been "indulged in by a host of older writers and perpetuated by some modern antiquaries." Such a sweeping challenge might have been in order before the renaissance of Celtic learning, but in view of the findings not only of older Celtic scholars such as O'Curry and D'Arbois de Jubainville, but also of a host of more recent Celtic celebrities such as E. Hull, J. Rhys, W. Stokes, Kuno Meyer, T. D. Kendrick and E. MacNeill, it is nothing short of intellectual snobbery. It tends, in fact, to put the student of Celtic antiquities on the *qui vive* for flaws and unconcluded sentences, of which there are not a few, in the interpretations of the very presumptuous Mr. Spence.

Mr. Spence's thesis, by no means an original one notwithstanding his assertions to the contrary, is to present Druidism as an early Western European ritual of the primitive worship of sacred food-bearing trees such as the Oak, and of ancient beliefs concerning the Divine Kingship such as the Egyptian legend of Osiris. Like many scholars before him, Mr. Spence derives the word Druid from *darach* or *doire*, the gaelic words for "oak" and "grove." He then proceeds to give a pretty full account of the theology, ritual, places of worship and magical arts, always mindful of his initial purpose of connecting Druidism with the cultus of the Oak. He seeks to prove Caesar's charge of sacred cannibalism against the Druids, and with the fatal enthusiasm of the antiquary, he confounds Druidic magic with evidence of the miraculous in early Christian eschatological literature, and indeed to the disparagement of the latter. Thus in St. Patrick's

¹ *The History and Origins of Druidism*, by Louis Spence. New York. Barnes and Noble. 1949. pp. 199. \$4.50.

*Father Coonan is associate professor of history at Saint Louis University.

contests with the Druids at the court of King Laoghaire at Tara, he has Patrick match magic with magic simply because he invoked the aid of God to dispel an artificial darkness magically produced by the Druids.

Mr. Spence's footnotes reveal a fairly wide knowledge of the printed sources concerning Druidism, particularly in regard to secondary materials. It is, in fact, not untrue to characterize his work as essentially a critical restatement of the secondary authorities. As it is not unusual with such critiques, it displays a lamentable weakness for "I," "in my opinion" or "it is my considered judgment" in regard to matters known and emphasized for more than a century.

Mr. Spence's thesis connecting Druidism with the early cult of the Oak and with ancient theories of Divine Kingship is indeed a sound one. But a perusal of his book will reveal that he not only does not prove it, but that he labors the issue in a style so turgid that the reader is likely to come away with nothing better than a taste of acorns in his mouth.

M. D. Knowles' *Archbishop Beckett: A Character Study*² is a fully annotated pamphlet of thirty-one pages which was originally delivered to the British Academy (on the occasion of the Raleigh tercentenary of 1918) as the Raleigh Lecture on History. The subject is one of surpassing interest, for although the controversy between Henry II and Archbishop Thomas of Canterbury is one of the most familiar episodes of the Middle Ages, the character of St. Thomas, the most celebrated Englishman of his day, remains hidden and elusive.

This, as the author points out, is not the fault of the age in which he lived. We have a fairly clear idea of Henry II, Bernard of Clairvaux, Abelard, John of Salisbury, Eleanor of Aquitaine and other outstanding personalities of the twelfth century. Neither can it be attributed to lack of material. There are nine lives of the Archbishop in print, all written by contemporaries, several of whom were his intimate companions. There are also innumerable letters extant of the Archbishop himself, and the nine volumes of the Rolls Series devoted to the theme do not by any means exhaust all there is to find.

Mr. Knowles attempts to solve the difficulty from the quality of the written material and from the issue on which the canonization of St. Thomas was based. The Archbishop's biographers,

² *Archbishop Thomas Becket: A Character Study*, by M.D. Knowles. London. British Academy. 1949. pp. 31.

all clerks or monks, were, he states, so shocked by the murder, so dazzled by the corruscation of wonders and by the official canonization, and so devoted to the cause for which Thomas gave his life that they were committed to the sanctity of their subject. The Archbishop's letters, the author finds of no assistance. They were all written for some practical end in connection with the great controversy, and Thomas, a type of man who felt no need for literary self-expression, could write without revealing his personality. Finally his canonization was due "directly to his murder and to his posthumous fame, not to his personality."

Mr. Knowles reveals St. Thomas as a direct, masterful, Norman type of man of action cast in a heroic mould. He had a certain aversion to learning but a positive genius for leadership, organization and debate. Tall, pale, handsome, with dark eyes and aquiline nose, his bearing was magnificent, his practical intelligence enormous, his energy boundless and his approach ready. On the spiritual side he was gentle, truthful and devout, singularly pure and charitable throughout his life, and prudent until convinced that the time had come to dismiss the conciliation and neglect criticism. Yet he was vain, extravagant and ambitious, and the author is at a loss to reconcile these faults with even a "dawning sanctity." In this connection, however, it is noteworthy that the author inclines to the concept of sanctity as an exclusive mystic or heroic otherworldliness. The Curé of Ars would never have agreed with such a formula. It was his belief that a saint is a sinner who keeps on trying. Furthermore, the positive spiritual qualities which Mr. Knowles assigns to Archbishop Beckett are, notwithstanding his faults, those identified with sanctity in the *Iste Confessor*:

Qui pius, prudens, humilis, pudicus,
Sobriam duxit sine labe vitam.

As the struggle between Church and State in England approached its climax, the Archbishop, by Mr. Knowles' acknowledgement, was convinced that he was defending the rights of God as against Caesar and that only by his death would a solution be found. Yet the author fails to see in the revelation of such a spiritualized heroism the very spirit of martyrdom. This is in fact the weakness in a study otherwise luminously scholarly, sympathetically conceived and beautifully written.

³ *The Episcopal Colleagues of Archbishop Thomas Becket*, by David Knowles. Cambridge. University Press. 1951. pp. vii, 190. \$2.75.

The study entitled *The Episcopal Colleagues of Archbishop Thomas Beckett*³ is a reproduction of the Ford lectures delivered at Oxford University in 1949 by David Knowles, Professor of Medieval History at Cambridge University. As a second scholarly contribution to the history of the celebrated conflict between Henry II and Archbishop Thomas of Canterbury, it is fitting to review it immediately after the first contribution to the same subject. But since the surname of both authors happens to be the same, in order to avoid confusion the author of this second study will be referred to as Professor Knowles.

Professor Knowles properly argues that although the great contest between the King and the Archbishop began over the question of the competence of the ecclesiastical courts to try criminous clerics, the real issue lay in the determination of the State to assume overall control of the Church at a time when Rome had discarded the conciliatory Gelasian doctrine, with its implication of the equality of Church and State, for the vital and imperious Gregorian theory of ecclesiastical government with its emphasis on the paramountcy of the Church. In the circumstances, conflict was inevitable and compromise morally impossible. The King demanded the adhesion of all churchmen to the reputedly "ancestral customs of the realm" and of the royal government. The Archbishop countered with the rights of God as against Caesar. The King deceived Pope Alexander III into thinking that he wanted no more than a mere formal assurance to keep him in countenance with his lay barons and he complained bitterly of the Archbishop's intransigence. On receipt of this information from the Pope, coupled with a strong plea for moderation, the Archbishop yielded for himself and for the English hierarchy.

Thomas was quickly undeceived, for by insisting on the impossible constitutions of Clarendon, the King showed not only a sadistic will to break him, but also a determination to reduce the Church in England to a department of State. To the mind of the Archbishop there was now nothing for it but to fall back on his original position. He did so and commanded the other bishops to follow him, but it was then that he made the withering discovery that their solidarity had been broken.

It is with this angle of the conflict that Professor Knowles is primarily interested. He regards the bishops, who were inevi-

tably drawn into the conflict, as one of the most remarkable bodies of ecclesiastics in the history of Catholic England. He emphatically discards the judgment of older writers to the effect that most of them were on the King's side and tendered him solid support. He contends rather that, however excusable, it was Archbishop Thomas's *volte face* that broke their solidarity.

In the case of one of the bishops—Gilbert Foliot of London—Professor Knowles presents an irresolvable difficulty. A trusted son of Cluny, a "mirror of religion" and the "glory of the age," the question arises as to whether he was the Judas of the tragedy, for Foliot ultimately became the leader of the opposition for the King against the Archbishop. Professor Knowles brings to light such possible motivating factors as the prospects Foliot had once held of being Archbishop of Canterbury himself, his loud opposition to the "worldly" Chancellor Beckett's appointment thereunto, and his rise in the King's confidence in proportion to Beckett's decline; but with the detached attitude that each reader must decide the matter for himself.

Professor Knowles graciously acknowledges that he has not said the last word on his subject. Yet a fair criticism will, I think, consider his work a rare sample of the distinguished historical scholarship in things medieval that the student generally has come to associate with Cambridge University.

Now that the stupendous phase of British expansion which began in the time of Shakespeare is over, and that the British have expended their colonizing ability, C. E. Carrington feels that the time has come when a one volume history of the British Empire can be written. This is the express purpose of his lengthy book with its provocative title—*The British Overseas Exploits of a Nation of Shopkeepers*.⁴

Though the British Empire is an integral part of the Europeanization of the world which began with the imperial expansion of Spain and Portugal, the author sees its occasion in the rejection by Queen Elizabeth and her pirate-adventurers of the Papal Bull of 1493 dividing the colonial world between Spain and Portugal. The Queen felt that "the use of the sea and air is common to all," and soon she and her council were formulating the pragmatic principle that "there can be no dominion without effective occupation." This is an important point, if only because

⁴ *The British Overseas Exploits of a Nation of Shopkeepers*, by C.E. Carrington. Cambridge. University Press. 1950. pp. xiii, 1092. \$9.00.

it confirms George L. Beer's thesis in his excellent *Origins of the Old Colonial System*.

Mr. Carrington's study is primarily a development of the permanent settlements of the British in the empty lands of the temperate zone. He painstakingly describes the early colonies and the imperial wars waged by the English with the Spanish, French and Dutch in turn. He then approaches the American Revolution, and here he would seem desirous of assuming the mantle of Rudyard Kipling, for by a peculiar subjectivism he disparages the patriots and reduces the Revolution to something of a myth.

In the subsequent treatment of the Dominions and of the Commonwealth of Nations the great defect of Carrington's book shows up. For the sake of "brevity of reference" he includes the Irish with the British, and attempts to develop a complex subject lacking at every turn in homogeneity and uniformity without showing that the convulsion of British public life by the perennial Irish agitation was a most potent factor, if not the decisive one, in the evolution of the Commonwealth of Nations.

In conclusion, one might say that the student is in no real need of general histories of the British Empire such as Carrington's, but that he is in crying need of a study that will pull together its far-flung parts, purposes and interests by illustrating precisely how Ireland, or *laissez faire*, or democracy, or all three can be used as an archetype of later British imperial development or dissolution—whichever the Commonwealth of Nations may prove to be.

*Irish Nationalism and British Democracy*⁵ does a certain Marxist service to the great need of the student of British history which C. E. Carrington has failed to fulfill. I refer to the need of showing how the Irish Question, with its hatreds and enthusiasm, is an archetype, if not the archetype, of British imperial development. Eric Strauss is concerned neither with the history of Ireland or that of Great Britain, but with the nexus between the two countries, particularly during the period of the Legislative Union of 1801-1921. He very properly believes that any investigation of the Irish Question for the sake of raking up the embers of old controversies is to depreciate and to confound "a story of vital importance to modern British his-

⁵ *Irish Nationalism and British Imperialism*, by Eric Strauss. New York. Columbia University Press. 1951. pp.x, 307. \$4.25.

tory and, perhaps, to modern history in general." He goes on to illustrate with a wealth of argument that since the beginning of the nineteenth century Ireland has played a part out of all proportion to her size, wealth or position in the gradual democratization of Great Britain, and in the evolution of its by-product, Dominion Home Rule—the present day expression of which is the Commonwealth of free and equal nations.

It might be extremely helpful if Strauss's book were read in conjunction with Howard E. McIlwain's *The American Revolution, a Constitutional Interpretation*, or Robert Livingston Schuyler's *Parliament and the British Empire*, for both of these authorities marshal considerable source material to show that the American "constitutional agitation" against the claim of the British Parliament to a paramount imperial authority just before the Declaration of Independence was not only parallel to earlier Irish agitation for Legislative Independence, particularly during the Puritan Revolution, but that in all likelihood the arguments of the American patriots were plagiarized from the speeches and writings of Irish constitutional lawyers and statesmen. In a study entitled *The Irish Catholic Confederacy and the Puritan Revolution*, now in process of publication, this reviewer gives a full development of the earlier Irish agitation, and brings further into focus the striking parallel with the American Revolution. What, therefore, remains to be done is to pivot a study of the British Empire and Commonwealth upon the Irish Question and other basic archetypal ideas, in order to draw together in an intelligent and an intelligible synthesis the disparate and even multifarious ideas of imperialism, capitalism, freedom and democracy which underly the great world-encircling British experiment.

As far as it goes, Eric Strauss's study is a thought-provoking analysis. It might, however, be remarked that he confines himself to secondary source material. And few if anyone will agree with him that just because Repeal of the Union for O'Connell and Home Rule for Parnell were essentially middle class movements with emphasis on economics, Irish history or the Irish Question is any more susceptible to a Marxist—or even an eclectic Marxist—interpretation than the Icelandic *Eddas*. Perhaps the most important aspect of Irish history during the period covered by Eric Strauss was the Catholicization by the Irish of great scopes of the English speaking world; and who would be so audacious, if not so absurd, as to mirror Marx in such an other-

worldly phenomenon? The fatal attraction of Marxism for the author is, in fact, the flaw that obscures, if it does not spoil, an otherwise brilliant study, which in point of writing confirms Professor Robert Livingston Schuyler's credo that persons born under the English flag are apt to write as well as to speak the King's English.

Bermuda in the Old Empire,⁶ written by H. C. Wilkinson as a continuation of *Adventures of Bermuda*, is a significant production as a case study for early British colonial administration. The importance for England of Bermuda, the second oldest as well as the smallest of Britain's overseas colonies, was its strategic position on the highway of empire. It was a link between North America and the West Indies. Though one of the poorest outposts, it seemed imperative that none but the British should hold it, for its loss would imperil commerce.

Mr. Wilkinson's book abounds in all the gory details of the Old Colonial System. We read of trouble over taxation, land rents and levies; of Cromwell's laws of trade, navigation, exports and imports; of violent and glaring ship transgressions and misdemeanors; and of the manipulation of the country. There are tales, too, of piracy, smuggling, Spanish depredations, privateering, the Negro problem, the ignorance and incompetence of the local officials, insular sports and amusements, the ghastly slavery situation, and of the indignation caused by the Stamp Act. Much space is given to imperial defence, unjust taxation, deforestation, the conflict between Governor Robinson and Chief Justice Harde-snell, the state of Crown lands, currency problems, the continual assertion by the Bermuda Assembly of its rights, and the question of the franchise.

The detailed account of endless petty squabbles and of the economic ups and downs of the colony are both intricate and tiresome; and the book is indeed, as the author acknowledges, a history of little things. Yet the statement of Thomas Moore, its most distinguished Governor, to the effect that Bermuda deserved no history, was a jaundiced viewpoint, for it actually affords a fair epitome of almost every problem of the Old Colonial System.

⁶ *Bermuda in the Old Empire*, by Henry C. Wilkinson. Oxford. University Press. 1950. pp. ix, 457. \$6.50.

REVIEWS OF BOOKS

MEDIEVAL

A History of the Crusades. Volume I: The First Crusade and the Foundation of the Kingdom of Jerusalem, by Stephen Runciman. Cambridge. The University Press. 1951. pp. xiv, 377. \$5.00.

This is the first of a projected set of three volumes; Runciman's complete work will fill a blank which has been long deplored by mediaeval historians. It will be the first scholarly multi-volume general treatment of the Crusades in English, if we except Robson's century-old translation of Michaud. While most historians have shrunk from this colossal task Dr. Runciman has been prompted by his conviction that "the supreme duty of the historian is to write history, that is to say, to attempt to record in one sweeping sequence the greater events and movements that have swayed the destinies of man." The result is a scholarly, well documented summary which both profits from the numerous detailed studies of great historians within the last century and is dependent on Runciman's own intensive, direct use of the principal primary sources now available. The most difficult reading is to be found in the first ninety-two poorly integrated pages of background, wherein the author attempts to cover too much ground by highly concentrated pills of particular narrative. Thus, within the first ten pages, he swiftly mixes Sophronius, Omar, Constantine, Theodosius, Phocas, Heraclius, Chosroes II, the Patriarch Zarcharias, Jacob Baradaeus, Leo I, General Sharbaraz, and Queen Meryem, with many another into a swirling potpourri. Once he is past this background, however, the character of his work is entirely changed. The narrative from the Council of Piacenza in 1095 to the coronation of Baldwin I in Jerusalem in 1100 flows as smoothly as the finest fiction, and is just as fascinating reading. The principal personalities, such as Urban II, Alexius Comnenus, and the leaders of the First Crusade, are portrayed with masterly strokes. Many obscure points are cleared up, misconceptions banished, and questions which perplex the average mediaeval historian solved. The author does seem to indicate bias in favor of the Byzantine Empire,

which has been the object of his special study (*Byzantine Civilization*: 1936), together with a possible misconception of the position and policies of the Papacy. It does appear that he is putting the cart before the horse when he says that "In its desire to establish its authority, the Papacy sought to make the usages of the Church uniform." (p. 94) All in all, despite inevitable minor imperfections, this "*opus magnum*" of Runciman, when completed, will probably be another historical classic. It will be interesting to compare the individual work of a great British scholar with the projected forthcoming collaborative work of American historians known as "the University of Pennsylvania History of the Crusades."

Daniel D. McGarry, Saint Louis University.

Readings in the History of the Ancient World, by William C. McDermott, and Wallace E. Caldwell. New York. Rinehart. 1951. pp. xxii, 489. \$4.00.

The normal point of departure in the acquisition of a knowledge of history is the reading of standard textbooks. Obviously, such knowledge will lack depth unless the student has delved into the original sources upon which a later exposition and interpretation have been based. To assist in the acquisition of this thorough knowledge of ancient history, Professors McDermott and Caldwell have compiled and edited *Readings in the History of the Ancient World*. The work is intended to "present material that will not only guide students to further reading in the rich background of ancient literature but stimulate their reflection on problems in historiography."

To accomplish this purpose, the editors have gathered almost five hundred pages of selections, in translation, from the earliest written sources, from the remote era of Hammurabi down to the days of Diocletian and Constantine. Sources of the widest variety and interest are quoted, ranging from cuneiform inscriptions, the Sumerian Epic of Gilgamesh, and the Bible, through Homer, the Greek tragedians, Plato, and Aristotle, down to Livy, Suetonius, Tacitus, Lactantius, Sozomen, and Diocletian's *Edict on Prices*. The greater number of quotations are concerned with the history of Greece and Rome; Mesopotamia, Syria, and Egypt receive consideration in two of the fifteen chapters.

The first chapter, "History and Historians: Greek and Roman," deals with ancient historiography and is perhaps the most valuable chapter. In an eight-page introduction the editors give a

brief, but pointed criticism of Greek and Roman historians, from Herodotus to Ammianus Marcellinus. The selections of this chapter are culled from those ancient writers who *ex professo* discussed their views on the writing of history: Herodotus, Thucydides, Polybius, Cicero, Livy, Plutarch, Tacitus, and Cassius Dio.

The introductory notes of the remaining chapters are brief, but meaty. The entire volume will be of value to teachers and students, not only of ancient history, but also—if the two can be separated—of the ancient classics.

Mark Haworth, Saint Louis University.

MODERN

A History of England, by Keith Feiling. New York. McGraw Hill Book Company Inc. 1950. pp. xxxiv, 1229. \$6.00, text ed.

This is one of the most scholarly and one of the most readable surveys of English history that has appeared for many years. The author, who until recently has been Chichele Professor of History in the University of Oxford, has long been recognized as an outstanding authority on the subject; and this final statement, based on a life-time of study and reflection, will be welcomed at once by professional historians and by the general public. The interpretation does not differ as greatly from that of earlier writers as might have been expected by many who are familiar with Professor Feiling's earlier work and interests. It is on the whole a remarkably balanced account, informed throughout by a very evident spirit of patriotic pride, but free from the excesses, and from the prejudices and preconceptions which disfigure so many books of the kind. In that respect it provides an answer to those who maintain that interesting history cannot be written without a strong tincture of *parti pris*.

The bulk of the book consists of a political narrative; and the greater part, about two-thirds of the whole, deals with the centuries since the beginning of the Tudor period. These later sections are perhaps the most satisfactory portions of the book, although there are excellent chapters on the Anglo-Saxon period and on certain aspects of national development in the middle ages. Occasionally the author departs from the narrative form to survey a period of social and economic change, and to deal with such matters as literature, art and science. In some of these chapters the author is at his best. The account of the

growth of "English Civilization" from the Reformation to the close of the Puritan Revolution is perhaps as fine an essay on that difficult subject as will be found anywhere in comparable space. Many readers will probably share this reviewer's regret that so little of the book is given to such matters, and that so much of it is taken up with a chronological narrative, which must necessarily follow an orthodox, and sometimes a rather tedious pattern.

What stands out clearly in all this political narrative, and what gives its greatest interest, is the author's awareness of the importance of human beings. For Professor Feiling History is not the working out of some predestined process, nor the struggle of ineluctable forces that make of man a mere plaything. It is the record of what fallible men and women have done; and in this volume, as in his earlier work, he reveals his skill at portraying these human beings with all their virtues and defects, their courage, their wisdom or folly, their foibles and inconsistencies. Not all his judgments will be accepted without question. That on Henry VIII does not err on the side of severity. That on Oliver Cromwell tends to confirm the view that it is among conservative writers that the Puritan dictator now finds his stoutest defenders.

Comparatively little space is given to constitutional history: a somewhat surprising feature, since Professor Feiling himself states that "the nation's character and fortune have been largely due to its government, the essence of which is the rule of law." There are of course many references to legal and constitutional changes in the record of political events. But the method of dealing with this aspect of English history in occasional chapters which survey developments over long periods of time is not altogether satisfactory. There are, too, some inconsistencies. The work of Henry VIII and the Reformation Parliament is described as "The Modernising of England"; and there are numerous references in the chapters which follow to the revolution of the Tudor period. Yet the breach between Charles I and the House of Commons in 1629 is described as the breakdown of the medieval constitution. Most recent writers, with the work of Professor Notestein and Sir William Holdsworth before them, have preferred to regard this as the breakdown of the Tudor system; this is not quite the same thing as the breakdown of the medieval constitution.

The past two centuries, to which about one-third of the volume is given, are dealt with in considerable detail. The importance of the change to industrialism and democracy is everywhere apparent in these chapters. But again, the emphasis is on politics, and many readers will perhaps doubt whether the vast social changes of these centuries have received as much attention as they merit.

But this review must not end on a note of criticism. This is a remarkably fine piece of historical writing. There are indeed few books of comparable length which contain so much that is significant and illuminating on the development of the English nation. There are dull patches, and these are judgments—not a few of them—on which opinions will differ. But it will take its place at once as one of the best of the shorter histories of the English people, and one which no serious student can afford to neglect.

Donald J. McDougall, University of Toronto.

Der Josephinismus: Quellen zu seiner Geschichte in Oesterreich 1760-1790, edited by Ferdinand Maass. Vienna. Verlag Herold. 1951. pp. xxi, 395.

This volume is the first in the series of the Austrian Historical Commission's collection of source material on Josephinism. It deals with the 1760-1769 period, and it consists of the official documents from the *Wiener Haus-, Hof- und Staats-archiv*. The greater part of these are letters and memoranda by Kaunitz. The collection of documents is preceded by an excellent analysis of Josephinism by the editor of this volume. Students and college libraries where any work in Church history or in the *Aufklärung* is pursued will find this volume essential.

Thomas P. Neill, Saint Louis University.

The Beginnings of Diplomacy, by Ragnar Numelin. Philosophical Library. New York. 1950. 372 pages. \$12.00.

This is a scholarly and highly dependable sociological study of the process of diplomacy in its primitive forms. It includes a voluminous amount of material which the author has marshalled to support his own theses. It is a remarkable job of research and synthesis presented with scientific restraint.

The author proves conclusively that the prevention of conflict is a deep preoccupation and a carefully developed art among

primitive peoples. He frees himself of the shackles of ethnocentrism which would maintain that warfare is a universal institution of the human race. He correctly observes that modern, not primitive, warfare starts more often without discussion.

The envoys of primitive groups, whether peace negotiators or war emissaries, developed a large variety of behavioral patterns which stamped them as effective diplomats. The green branch, tabooed places and times, the practice of trade as a promoter of inter-tribal relations, were all cultural forms of high significance. The final chapter traces the development of diplomatic relations among historical peoples and makes general applications to the modern international scene.

The book is marred throughout by the most atrocious proof-reading this reviewer has ever noted. It was written in what the author calls his "acquired tongue" and could have been helpfully revised by someone to whom English is a native tongue.

Joseph H. Fichter, Loyola University of the South.

Some Modern Historians of Britain, Essays in Honor of R. L. Schuyler, edited by Herman Ausubel, J. Bartlet Brebner, and Erling M. Hunt. New York. The Dryden Press. 1951. pp. xiv, 384. \$5.00.

Professor Robert Schuyler has long been a distinguished figure among the historians of Britain and the Empire, and last year he was president of the American Historical Association. During his career as professor he has shown a lively interest in the craft of the historian; his presidential address was "The Historical Spirit Incarnate: Federic William Maitland."

It is therefore fitting that the *estschrift* in his honor should consist of essays by his former students on modern historians of Britain. Twenty-two historians are treated, from John Lingard to Eileen Power, in competently done essays by men and women who worked with these writers in Professor Schuyler's seminars. The essays run from fifteen to twenty pages each, and therefore they are limited to touching on each historian's major contribution to the historiography of Britain. The student will feel that this arrangement is profitable for giving him in a single volume a good survey of British historiography of the past century, but the specialist will perhaps wish that there were only half as many figures treated so that something more rounded and conclusive could be said about the more important historians and

the lesser figures omitted. That, however, is a matter of choice. The editors have done well in presenting these studies to Professor Schuyler and to the public.

Thomas P. Neill, Saint Louis University.

Renaissance to Reformation, by Albert Hyma. Grand Rapids. Wm. B. Erdmans Publishing Company. 1951. pp. 591. \$6.00.

Too frequently important research publications in history, are, in the course of time, unavailable to the scholar or the student, because of the limited number of copies of the original edition. Professor Hyma has, fortunately, seen fit to re-issue several of his more important studies of the Renaissance and Reformation which were written during the past three decades. Among the works included in this volume are *The Youth of Erasmus* (1930) an excellent and scholarly biography of Erasmus to 1494, but a biography whose interpretations must be qualified; the significant *Christian Renaissance* (1924) an essay which advanced the concept that the Northern Renaissance was essentially more Christian (in the Protestant sense) than humanistic, and stressed in the influence of the "Devotio Moderna" movement on Luther, Calvin, Erasmus and Loyola; *Christianity, Capitalism and Communism* (1937) which correctly assesses the very limited influence of Calvin and Luther in the development of capitalism in the 16th century.

While Dr. Hyma's works are well written and stimulating to read, it is not always possible to accept his conclusions. The influence which he attributes to the "Devotio Moderna" on such diverse people as Luther (p. 138), Erasmus (p. 138) and Loyola (pp. 363-367) is too great to accept. Criticisms of this nature greeted the author in 1924 and he replied in his "The Influence of the Devotio Moderna" in the *Nederlandsche Archief voor Kerkgechiednis* (1926). Again, the author stresses that in 1520 the Papal Court had to decide whether to sacrifice Erasmus or Luther "for there was not enough room in the Church for both" (pp. 277-278). It was not a question of "room" or "sacrifice" but of legitimate submission to the doctrinal teachings of Roman Catholicism. The results of Luther's refusal have remained tragically apparent ever since 1521.

The author's sympathy for the Protestants is ever apparent. This, in itself, is not to be condemned. A work which does not propound opinions and render decisions may be compared with

the medusa. However, a study which stresses Martin Luther's consistency (p. 305, p. 334) cannot but puzzle the reader and recall to mind Grisar's comment,

"A glance at the weather cock of expediency will tell us which tendency we may expect to find predominant, for as a rule, it is the prospect of success that decides him [Luther]. The present day observer of such vacillation . . . will naturally ask himself how it was that Luther's fickleness failed to discourage his followers . . ." (H. Grisar, *Luther, His Life and Work*, Vol. V, p. 604.)

Whatever Luther's intentions and opinions on the relations of Church and State, there can be little doubt that his teaching led to the subjugation of the Lutheran church in the state. This is a historical fact.

The author is not, however, an historian who refuses to recognize the soundness and scholarship of the opposition, viz., the Catholics. In a highly illuminating and concluding chapter, Professor Hyma analyzes several prominent Catholic and Protestant scholars and their works. He is ever willing to admit that there is scholarship and truth in both camps. His position is best indicated by the following passage:

In spite of all the quarreling between Catholics and Protestants, we must not lose sight of the fact that the orthodox Protestants and the Roman Catholics have much more in common than the liberal and the orthodox Protestants. A person who denies the veracity of the Apostles Creed . . . is much farther removed from the Roman Catholic faith than is the good Lutheran or Calvinist. What modern scholarship needs especially at the present time is an understanding of the innate brotherhood of all orthodox Christians . . ." (p. 557).

Clarence L. Hohl, Jr., Saint Louis University.

AMERICAN

The Amiable Baltimoreans, by Francis F. Beirne. New York. Dutton. 1951. pp. 400. \$5.00.

Mr. Beirne sees his adopted city as a glorified market-town, fond of comfort and disinclined to be hurried, with a ten-o'clock curfew and a prejudice against innovation. Its essentials, unaltered through two centuries, he finds in outstanding physicians,

grain exports, iron works, shipyards, and a race track; its strength in "the fruitful collaboration of a Yankee and a Southerner against a British baronial background" to exploit the energies of newcomers before they too "succumb to the native lethargy." The amiability of its burghers is discernible but hardly distinctive; on Mr. Beirne's own showing, *apathetic* would have been a better term. If anything, it is a transcendent capacity for taking little trouble—for mild interest and resolute inaction—that gives the city its cachet. Like the vapid features of the "immortal" Betsy Patterson, aptly chosen for a frontispiece, Baltimore is shown as distinguished chiefly by its want of distinction.

This eighth volume of the Society in America Series is a generous medley of half-familiar facts, fairly well winnowed from legend. The author is a willing prisoner of his predecessors in the field, and they do not treat him badly. He has crowded more of anecdote and statistic into his pages than could well be expected; his devoted scraping of the barrel's bottom to list other Baltimore "firsts" besides ice cream and gaslight reflects more credit on his industry than on his city's. His aim was popularization, and, given so much that will mildly interest Baltimoreans and a little that may invite sociologists, one need not quarrel with his choice to enlarge a trivial picture here or there and to leave untouched a few of significance which earlier writers did not develop.

There is a sketchy chapter on Baltimore's origins and fuller ones on its topography, weather, and modest military history. Others deal with its port, railroads, monuments, theaters, and hotels, its Germans and Jews and Negroes, sports, newspapers, politics, literature, fires, and foods, and the riots that once occasioned the nickname of "Mobtown." The two chapters on education are devoted exclusively to John Hopkins University; three, ultimately, to Society; and one to the four Victorian merchants whose names still shroud the city. "Remove the names and works of Peabody, Johns Hopkins, Pratt, and Walters," says Mr. Beirne, "and Baltimore . . . would be just another town." It is.

Errors and inconsistencies are few and minor: for example, the birth date of Enoch Pratt is given as 1805 instead of 1808; and accumulated evidence rebuts Mr. Beirne's attribution of altruism to Pratt and his fellow-merchants. There is an 18-page index, chiefly of proper names. The bibliography omits F. P. Stieff's

Government of a Great American City, C. C. Hall's *Baltimore: Its History and Its People*, and Meredith Janvier's *Baltimore Yesterdays*. On the whole, Baltimore has here little ground for complaint, and Mr. Beirne has some for complacency. But the social history of Baltimore remains to be written.

William Davish, Loyola, Baltimore.

The Growth of the American Economy, edited by Harold F. Williamson. 2nd edition. New York. Prentice-Hall. 1951. pp. xiv, 946. \$7.65 (trade). \$5.75 (schools).

This book is by no means a stranger to teachers and students of American history. The first edition appeared in 1944 and received wide acceptance as a text and book of collateral readings.

This second edition merits the description of being a thorough revision, partial rearrangement, and substantial enlargement. Most noteworthy from the point of view of many teachers is the fact that the articles have in many cases been cut up so that the work falls neatly four sharply defined chronological divisions, a fact that will facilitate its use for collateral reading assignments.

There is much to be said for history books of considerable length which are the cooperative work of a number of specialists. The result in this case is not only good economic history but also an excellent teaching tool.

Richard L. Porter, S.J., Saint Louis University.

Here They Once Stood: The Tragic End of the Apalachee Missions, by Mark F. Boyd, Hale G. Smith and John W. Griffin. Gainesville. University of Florida Press. 1951. pp. xvii, 189. \$3.75.

We have here an excellent and valuable piece of historical and archaeological research. As stated in the sub-title, it deals with "The Tragic End of the Apalachee Missions" in Western Florida. It is the story of a ruthless coward's vengeance that culminated at Ayubale on January 25, 1704, in the horrible torture death of two Franciscan missionaries, four Spanish soldiers and a number of Christian Indians. Concerning this incident of Florida mission history John Gilmary Shea wrote: "The martyrdom of Ayubale has no parallel in our annals except in the deaths of Fathers Brébeuf, Lalemant, Daniel and Garnier in the Huron country, which has been so often and so pathetically described;

but the butcheries perpetrated there were not enacted before the eyes and by the order of the Governor of a Christian colony" (*The Catholic Church in Colonial Days*, p. 463).

The coward who headed this campaign of vengeance against the Apalachee missions and basely connived at the Ayubale massacre was James Moore, mistakenly called governor by Shea. After failing in 1702 to seize and destroy Saint Augustine, he was supplanted in the governorship of Carolina by Nathaniel Johnson. Moore, the discredited ex-governor, was then appointed a colonel in the Carolinian army and, as Herbert E. Bolton puts it "was given a chance to retrieve his lost reputation by a new campaign against Apalachee" (*The Debatable Land*, p. 60), i.e. against the Spanish missions and settlements in Western Florida. With the aid of his thousand pagan Apalachicolas, known as Creeks to the English, Moore succeeded in laying waste the missions and settlements, carrying off as slaves the Christian mission Indians who did not fall victims to the fury of Moore's allies. Whatever "reputation" Moore may have had before this campaign of vengeance, he certainly did not retrieve it during this senseless raid. The campaign has little to commend it for military leadership and bravery on the part of Moore, while the Ayubale massacre in particular has gone down in history as just that—an inhuman massacre in the blackest sense of the term.

The volume before us is divided into three sections. Section I (pp. 1-104) comprises a well-annotated "Introduction" (pp. 1-19) by Mark F. Boyd who also prepared for publication the series of forty-five documents (pp. 20-104), printed in this section of the volume, which cover the history of Western Florida from 1693 to 1708. Forty-three of the documents are from the Archives of the Indies in Seville, Spain. The remaining two documents—letters of Moore written in April, 1704—are from the Library of Congress in Washington. Of special interest and value are the two letters of the Indian convert, Don Patricio Hinachuba (Docs. 6 and 7), the correspondence that followed the Ayubale massacre (Docs. 25 and 26), and especially the "Extracts from the auto of an inquiry into the deaths of the Fathers in Apalachee . . ." (Doc. 39).

Sections II and III of the volume comprise the achæological portion, i. e. the results of the scientific investigations conducted in an effort to determine the sites once occupied by the missions and settlements in Western Florida. Section II (pp. 105-136),

contributed by Hale G. Smith, deals with "A Spanish Mission Site in Jefferson County, Florida." Section III (pp. 137-160) contains the results of the "Excavations at the Site of San Luis." This section was contributed by John W. Griffin, whose concluding statement is well worth quoting. He writes:

"So far as the Spanish missions of Apalachee are concerned, the translation of contemporary documents and the excavations at two sites have provided us with a solid foundation from which to view the period and its characteristics. The picture which emerges is not one of cloistered gardens, tolling bells, and peaceful idyllic communities. Rather it is one of crude structures and few tools, of poverty and discord, of war and martyrdom; but it is a picture of greater interest than one painted with the brush of romance, for it is related to reality" (p. 158).

Appended to the volume are, a highly technical discussion by Hale G. Smith of "Leon-Jefferson Ceramic Types" uncovered during excavations made at certain mission sites in this region, and a summary presented by John W. Griffin and Hale G. Smith of archaeological materials found at the site of San Luis and San Francisco de Oconee missions. Following these two valuable contributions are twelve plates illustrating the historical and archaeological matter treated in the volume.

The three scholars who collaborated in preparing this volume for publication deserve high praise for the serious effort they put into the work. Let us hope that the catchy title "Here They Once Stood" will not mislead students of Florida history into concluding that we have here a volume that merits no attention and can be readily dispensed with. It is on the contrary a work that manifests serious study, fine scholarship and high effort to get at and establish the truth regarding "The Tragic End of the Apalachee Missions."

Francis Borgia Steck, O.F.M., Quincy College.

Land of the Conquistadores, by Cleve Hallenbeck. Caldwell, Idaho. The Caxton Printers, Ltd. 1950. pp. xiv, 375. Illustrations, maps, charts. \$5.00.

When one finishes this book, the loss which lovers of the history of the Spanish Southwest sustained in the untimely death of the author (1949) is realized most poignantly. Mr. Hallenbeck was an amateur of this history in the first and strictest sense of that

word. By profession he was a meteorologist, but long years on assignment in New Mexico gave him a love for the country where the United States Weather Bureau has placed him and gave him, too, a love for that region's fascinating past. In the present work he has retold the story of New Mexico during its Spanish centuries and the quarter-century when the Mexicans were in control after winning independence from the mother country. He has drawn together much research of recent decades and distilled it into a very worthwhile and eminently readable book. One or other study may have been missed, most notable is J. Manuel Espinosa's *Crusaders of the Río Grande* and several of the volumes of the Coronado Quarto Centennial series, but, these apart, the author's coverage of the sources and monographs has been quite complete.

After telling the story in chronological sequence, Mr. Hallenbeck has added several extremely valuable institutional chapters—government, the missions, population, industries, commerce, colonial life, the New Mexico *Camino Real*. At times, particularly in the narration of the events and the evaluation of the characters of the seventeenth century, the author is needlessly harsh on some of the friars—even granting that these earnest, but not always tactful nor always judicious, men were often more than a little removed from the ideals of religious and Christian perfection which their sainted founder had set for them. Even so, Mr. Hallenbeck has made a valuable contribution to New Mexican historiography and to a sympathetic understanding of the past of our forty-seventh state.

John Francis Bannon, Saint Louis University.

EDITOR'S NOTE:

The Jesuit Bibliography, begun in March, 1952, and continued in May, will be continued in the January issue of this volume.

CURRENT BIBLIOGRAPHY

This bibliography is intended to be of service to teachers and students of history by presenting a fairly complete list of historical works announced or published since the previous issue of *The Historical Bulletin*. An asterisk denotes a review of the book in this or a later issue. Unfortunately sometimes the price and number of pages is not mentioned.

MEDIAEVAL

- Bernheimer, Richard, *Wild men in the Middle Ages*. Harvard. pp. 237. \$4.00.
- Boehner, P., *Medieval Logic*. Univ. of Chicago. pp. 147. \$3.00.
- Caldwell, Wallace Everett, and Merrill, Edward Hackett, *World History*. Sanborn. pp. 879. \$3.96.
- Cameron, Meribet Elliott, et al., *China, Japan, and the Powers*. Ronald. pp. 695. \$6.50.
- Charlesworth, Martin Percival, et al., *The Heritage of Early Britain*. British Bk. Centre. pp. 220. \$2.50.
- Childe, V. Gordon, *Prehistoric Migrations in Europe*. Instituttet for Sammenlignende Kulturforskning. pp. 249. (price unavailable.)
- The work consists in substance the author's lectures before the Institut for Sammenlignende Kulturforskning delivered in 1946, but the author has used materials published after the war for additional factual material.
- Clark, John G.D., *Prehistoric Europe*. Philosophical Lib. pp. 365. \$12.00.
- Copleston, Frederick C., *Medieval Philosophy*. Philosophical Lib. pp. 199. \$2.75.
- Finley, Moses I., *Studies in Land and Credit in Ancient Athens*. Rutgers Univ. Press. pp. 344. \$3.50.
- *Finegan, Jack, *The Archeology of World Religions*. Princeton. pp. 639. \$10.00.
- *Ganshoff, François L., *Feudalism*. Longmans. pp. 179. \$3.25.
- Hardy, Edward R., *Christian Egypt*. Oxford. pp. 249. \$3.50.
- Harrison, Frederick, *Life in a Medieval College*. Transatlantic Arts. pp. 349. \$5.00.
- Hawkes, Mrs. Jacqueline, *History in Earth and Stone*. Harvard. pp. 335. \$3.75.
- Head, Eldred D., *New Testament Life and Literature as Reflected in the Papyri*. Broadman. pp. 159. \$2.00.
- *Holmes, Urban T., *Daily Living in the Twelfth Century*. Univ. of Wisconsin Press. pp. 337. \$3.85.
- *Hoyt, Robert S., *Royal Demesne in English Constitutional History, 1066-1272*. Cornell Univ. Press. pp. 253. \$3.50.
- Johnson, Allan C., *Egypt and the Roman Empire*. Univ. of Michigan Press. pp. 190. \$3.50.
- Lamb, Harold, *Theodora and the Emperor*. Doubleday. pp. 336. \$4.50.
- Leakey, Louis S.B., and Cole, Sonia, eds., *Proceedings of the Pan-African Congress on Prehistory, 1947*. Philosophical Lib. pp. 247. \$8.75.

- Leatham Diana, *Celtic Sunrise*. British Bk. Centre. pp. 191. \$2.75.
 Lietzmann, Hans, *The Era of the Church Fathers*. Scribner. pp. 212. \$4.00.
 *McKnight, John P., *The Papacy*. Rinehart. pp. 437. \$5.00.
 *Moorman, John Richard, *The Grey Friars in Cambridge, 1225-1538*. Cambridge Univ. Press. pp. 285. \$7.00.
 *Previté-Orton, Charles W., *A History of Europe from 1198 to 1378*. Barnes and Noble. pp. 479. \$6.00.
 Richardson, Henry G., and Sayles, George O., *The Irish Parliament in the Middle Ages*. Univ. of Pennsylvania Press. pp. 405. \$8.50.
 Raftery, Joseph, *Prehistoric Ireland*. British Bk. Centre. pp. 244. \$3.50.
 Rosenheim, R., *The Eternal Drama*. Philosophical Lib. pp. 303. \$6.00.

A record "of the way in which humanity has marked the score of its progressive evolution on the tablets of contemporary drama and theatre through the ages."

- St. Prosper of Aquitaine, *The Call of All Nations*. Translated and annotated by P. De Letter, S.J. Newman. pp. 234. \$3.25.

Another worthy volume to the series of translations of the Fathers, "Ancient Christian Writers." This treatise, probably authored by St. Prosper about 450, presents the first work in ancient Christian literature on the problem of the salvation of the Infidels.

- *Schuster, Cardinal Ildefonso, *Saint Benedict and His Times*. Herder. pp. 396. \$6.00.
 *Schuyler, Robert L., and Ausubel, Herman, *Making of English History*. Dryden Press. pp. 686. \$5.60.
 Stenton, Doris M., *English Society in the Early Middle Ages, 1066-1307*. Pelican Book. pp. 228. 2/6.

This is the third volume of the Pelican History of England. It presents to the student and teacher a very good history at a very modest price.

- Smalley, Beryl, *The Study of the Bible in the Middle Ages* (2d. ed.) Philosophical Lib. pp. 428. \$7.50.
 *Smith, A.H., *New College, Oxford, and Its Buildings*. Oxford. pp. 199. \$4.25.
 Stephenson, Carl, *Medieval History*. (3d ed.) Harper. pp. 572. \$6.00.

A third edition, basically the same as the revised second edition with some additions in the matter of social history of the Middle Ages.

- Talbot Rice, David, *English Art, 871-1100*. Oxford. pp. 395. \$10.00.
 Taru, William W., *Hellenistic Civilization* (3d rev. ed.). Longmans. pp. 383. \$4.75.
 Thomas, Edward J., *The Life of Budha as Legend and History* (3d ed.). Barnes and Noble. pp. 313. \$6.50.
 *Thomas, Mary E., *Medieval Skepticism and Chaucer*. William-Frederick. pp. 184. \$3.00.
 Velikovsky, Immanuel, *Ages in Chaos; v. 1, From the Exodus to King Akhnaton*. Doubleday. pp. 374. \$4.50.
 Villiers, Alan J., *Monsoon Seas*. McGraw-Hill. pp. 348. \$4.75.
 Wallace-Hadrill, J.M., *The Barbarian West, 400-1000*. Longmans. pp. 157. \$1.80 (Text ed.).

- Whitlock, Dorothy, *The Beginnings of English Society*. Penguin Bks. pp. 256. \$0.65.
- Wilkinson, Bertie, *Constitutional History of Medieval England, 1216-1399*. v. 2. Longmans. pp. 348. \$4.75.
- *Wilson, R.M., *The Lost Literature of Medieval England*. Philosophical Lib. pp. 272. \$4.50.
- *Wood, Herbert J., *Exploration and Discovery*. Longmans. pp. 192. \$1.80. (Text ed.)
- *Woodcock, Brian L., *Medieval ecclesiastical Courts in the Diocese of Canterbury*. Oxford. pp. 171. \$3.50.

MODERN

- Azpiazú y Zulaica, José J., *The Corporate State*. Herder. pp. 271. \$4.00.
- Bainton, Roland H., *The Reformation of the Sixteenth Century*. Beacon. pp. 287. \$3.75.
- Baumol, William J., *Welfare Economics and the Theory of the State*. Harvard. pp. 171. \$4.25.
- *Baker, Herschel, *The Wars of Truth*. Harvard. pp. 390. \$6.00.
- *Beck, George A., *English Catholics 1850-1950*. Burns Oates. pp. 639. \$6.50.
- Beckett, James C., *A Short History of Ireland*. Longmans. pp. 208. \$1.80 (Text ed.).
- Bertrand, Henri-Gratien, *Napoleon at St. Helena*. Doubleday. pp. 318. \$3.75.
- Bertrand, Louis; Petrie, Sir Charles, *The History of Spain*. Macmillan. pp. 431. \$6.00.
- Bonniwell, W.R., *The Story of Margaret of Metola*. Kenedy. pp. 177. \$2.50.
- Brinton, Crane, *Anatomy of Revolution*. Prentice Hall. pp. 324. \$5.00.
- A new edition in which the author "Has gone carefully over the original text . . . making many changes throughout, and bringing the bibliographical suggestions up to date." Major changes deal with materials on the Russian Revolution.
- *Brock, W.R., *Britain and the Dominions*. Cambridge. pp. 521. \$2.50.
- Brogan, Denis W., *The Price of Revolution*. Harper. pp. 288. \$3.50.
- Carlyle, Margaret, ed., *Documents on international affairs, 1947-1948*. Oxford. pp. 905. \$14.00.
- Carr, Edward H., *The Bolshevik Revolution 1917-1923*; v. 2. Macmillan. pp. 407. \$6.00.
- Coste, Pierre, *The Life and Works of St. Vincent de Paul*. Newman, 3v. \$15.00.
- Currey, Charles H., *The British Commonwealth since 1815*; Anglobks. 2v. \$6.25.
- Easum, Chester V., *Half Century of Conflict*. Harper. pp. 929. \$6.00.
- A general text for the period 1900-1950 combining both political and military history. The reader generally finds a spade called by that name.
- Edmonds, Sir James E., *World War I*. Oxford. pp. 454. \$7.00.
- This work, written by the Official Historian, will prove useful to teachers, presenting as it does an authoritative account compiled from vast sources of documents open to a writer in General Edmonds' position.

- *Emerson, William R., *Monmouth's Rebellion*. Yale. pp. 107. \$2.00.
- Gordon, Major Lawrence L., *British Battles and Medals*. British Bk. Centre. pp. 431. \$12.50.
- Grant, Arthur J., *A History of Europe from 1494 to 1610*. (5th ed.) Barnes and Noble. pp. 585. \$5.00.
- Grant, Arthur J., and Temperley, Harold, W.V., *Europe in the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries*. (6th rev. ed.) Longmans. pp. 625. \$4.75.
- Guderian, General Heinz, *Panzer leader*. Dutton. pp. 528. \$7.50.
- *Haffert, John M., *Russia Will Be Converted*. A.M.I. International Press. pp. 270. \$3.00.
- Halecki, Oscar, *Borderlands of Western Civilization*. Ronald. pp. 519. \$6.00.
- *Harcave, Sydney, *Russia—a History*. Lippincott. pp. 665. \$6.00.
- Harlow, Vincent T., *The Founding of the Second British Empire*. v. 1. Longmans. pp. 672. \$8.75.
- Harrison, John B., *This Age of Global Strife*. Lippincott. pp. 470. \$7.25.
- A recent-world-history text which gives the domestic history of nations only in relation to the international scene, and which treats the period 1914-1950 viewing World War I and the period to 1939 under the significant heading, "Coming of World War II."
- Hinsley, F.H., *Hitler's Strategy*. Cambridge. pp. 244. \$3.75.
- This book uses primarily the complete naval archives captured when Germany was overrun, particularly the file of minutes of the conferences of Hitler with his naval chiefs.
- Hyamson, Albert M., *The Sephardim of England*. British Bk. Centre. pp. 480. \$7.50.
- Keeton, George W., and Schwarzenberger, Georg, eds., *The Year Book of World Affairs, 1952*. Praeger. pp. 390. \$7.50.
- Latourette, Kenneth S., *A Short History of the Far East*. Macmillan. pp. 730. \$5.25.
- The revised edition of a scholarly work written for the "thoughtful, educated Americans who have no previous contact with the region and who desire such a survey as will give them background for an understanding of the peoples, the culture and the current problems of that area."
- Lenczowski, George, *The Middle East in World Affairs*. Cornell Univ. Press. pp. 479. \$6.00.
- Lindsay, Donald, and Washington, E.S., *A Portrait of Britain between the Exhibitions, 1851-1951*. Oxford. pp. 324. \$3.00.
- Manning, Clarence A., *The Siberian Fiasco*. Library Publishers. pp. 210. \$3.75.
- Mathew, David, *The Age of Charles I*. British Bk. Centre. pp. 340. \$4.50.
- Martyrdom of Silesian Priests. Kirchliche Hilfsstelle.
- This book, a modern martyrology, can well be used as gruesome illustration of "Russian Democracy" in its practical applications.
- Myers, Alec R., *England in the Late Middle Ages*. Penguin Bks. pp. 278. \$0.75.
- O'Brien, C. Bickford, *Russia under Two Tsars, 1682-1689*. Univ. of California Press. pp. 190. \$3.50.

Ostovic, P.D., *The Truth about Yugoslavia*. Roy. pp. 323. \$3.50.

Payne, Robert, *Mao Tse-tung, Ruler of Red China*. Schuman. pp. 320. \$3.50.

This is the first lengthy biography in English of the ruler of Red China who from the desk of the librarian of Peking University has come to dominate the lives of some 400 millions of people. Besides the story of Mao Tse-tung, this book contains the author's own theories on the rise of Communism in China—some of which are certainly open to disputation.

Plamenatz, John Petrov, *The Revolutionary Movement in France, 1815-1871*. Longmans. pp. 198. \$3.25.

*Plattner, Felix A., *Jesuits Go East*. Newman. pp. 283. \$3.50.

Putnam, Peter, ed., *Seven Britons in Imperial Russia, 1698-1812*. Princeton. pp. 458. \$7.50.

Reshetar, John S., *The Ukrainian Revolution, 1917-1920*. Princeton. pp. 373. \$5.00.

Richardson, W.C., *Tudor Chamber Administration, 1485-1547*. La. State Univ. Press. pp. 554. \$6.50.

Roth, Cecil, *Benjamin Disraeli, Earl of Beaconsfield*. Phil. Lib. pp. 186. \$3.75.

Spiegel, Henry W., *The Development of Economic Thought*. Wiley. pp. 811. \$6.50.

Sprague de Campe, L., and Ley W., *Lands Beyond*. Rinehart. pp. 214. \$3.50.

An attempt to write the story of exploration from the point of view of what people wanted, or hoped to find, instead of what they did discover.

Taylor, J., *The Economic Development of Poland, 1919-1950*. Cornell Univ. Press. pp. 236. \$3.75.

Upton, E.S., and Winship, G.P., *Guide to Sources of English History from 1603 to 1660 in Reports of the Royal Commission on Historical Manuscripts*. Scarecrow Press. pp. 179. \$3.50.

de Valdes (Alfonso) and the Sack of Rome. Univ. of N.M. Press. pp. 120. \$3.50.

*Waite, Robert, G.L., *Vanguard of Nazism*. Harvard. pp. 344. \$6.00.

White, Reginald J., ed., *The Conservative Tradition*. British Bk. Centre. pp. 275. \$3.50.

AMERICAN

Baldwin, Leland D., *The Stream of American History*; v. 1. Amer. Bk. pp. 991. \$6.00.

*Bannon, John F., *History of the Americas*; v. 1. McGraw-Hill. pp. 594. \$5.50.

Barck, Oscar T., and Blake, Nelson M., *Since 1900*. Macmillan. pp. 913. \$8.00.

Bender, Averam B., *The March of Empire*. Univ. of Kansas Press. pp. 323. \$5.00.

Bernstein, Harry *Modern and Contemporary Latin America*. Lippincott. pp. 727. \$6.00.

*Binkley, William C., *Texas Revolution*. La. State Univ. Press. pp. 131. \$2.50.

Blake, Nelson M., *A Short History of American Life*. McGraw-Hill. pp. 742. \$5.75.

Brown, William S., *California, Northeast, the Bloody Ground*. Biobks. pp. 225. \$15.00.

Carman, Harry, *A History of the American People*. Columbia Univ. Press. 2 v. \$5.75 each.

These two volumes "within the framework of political perspective examine the economic forces that have contributed to the development of American social and intellectual history."

*Callender, Clarence N., and Charlesworth, James C., eds., *Ethical Standards in American Public Life*. Amer. Acad. of Pol. Sc. pp. 265. \$2.00 (paper).

Cheever, Daniel S., and Haviland, H. Field. *American Foreign Policy and the Separation of Powers*. Harvard. pp. 256. \$3.75.

Costin, William C., and Watson, John S., *The Law and Working of the Constitution*. Macmillan. 2v. \$9.50.

Eyck, Erich, *Pitt versus Fox*. Macmillan. pp. 404. \$4.50.

Faulkner, Harold U., *American Political and Social History*. 6th ed. Appleton-Century-Crofts. pp. 984. \$6.00.

This sixth edition of one of the standard texts contains additional bibliographical materials and the final chapter comes down to 1952.

Gibson, Charles, *Tlaxcala in the Sixteenth Century*. Lale. pp. 316. \$6.00.

Glen, James, and Milligen-Johnston, George, *Colonial South Carolina*. Univ. of S.C. Press. pp. 231. \$4.00.

Greer, James K., *Colonel Jack Hayes*. Dutton. pp. 428. \$6.00.

The biography of a famous Texas Ranger, Indian fighter, and pioneer in the building of the present state of California, this book affords good secondary reading material for college history courses.

Guyton, Pear V., *Our Mississippi*. Steck. pp. 478. \$4.00.

Hanke, Lewis U., *Bartolome de Las Casas*. Univ. of Pa. Press. pp. 131. \$3.50.

*Hoehn, M., ed., *Catholic Authors*. St. Mary's Abbey. pp. 633. \$6.50.

*Hu, Tun-yuan, *The Liquor Tax in the United States, 1791-1947*. Columbia Univ. pp. 188. \$2.75.

*Hopkins, Vincent C., *Dred Scott's Case*. McMullen. pp. 213. \$4.00.

Huber, Raphael M., *Our Bishops Speak*. Bruce. pp. 402. \$6.00.

This volume contains statements of the Hierarchy of the United States and of the Administrative Board of the NCWC for the important years 1919-1951. It will prove of real benefit to teachers of American history.

Keenleyside, Hugh L., *Canada and the United States*. Knopf. pp. 444. \$6.00.

*Kull, Irving S., and Kull, Nell M., *A Short Chronology of American History, 1492-1950*. Rutgers Univ. Press. pp. 388. \$6.50.

Lane, Robert E., *Problems in American Government*. Prentice Hall. pp. 373. \$2.85.

A workbook that embodies cases, opinions and discussions, to be used as a supplement to a text. A worthy objective of the writer has been to force the student to have some reasonable basis, at least, for his judgments, and to be able to express it.

Leopold, Richard W., and Link, Arthur S., *Problems in American History*. Prentice Hall. pp. 953. \$5.95 (Text ed.).

Lewis, McMillan, *Woodrow Wilson of Princeton*. Livingston. pp. 130. \$2.50.

*Lewis, Robert G., *The Handbook of American Railroads*. Simmons-Boardman. pp. 253. \$2.95.

Kjelgaard, Jim, *The Explorations of Pere Marquette*. E.M.Hale. pp. 192. \$2.12.

Kino, Eusebio F., *Father Kino at La Paz, April, 1683*. Dawsons. pp. 37. \$5.00.

*McGann, Franklin T., *English Discovery of America to 1585*. King's Crown Pr. pp. 246. \$3.50.

Magaret, Helene, *Giant in the Wilderness*. Bruce. pp. 200. \$3.50.

A fictionalized biography of Father Nerinckx, pioneer priest of Kentucky and founder of the Sisters of Loretto. It will make excellent secondary reading for the students, and for those who do not wish to tackle the older biographies by Howlett and Maes.

*Montross, Lynn, *Rag, Tag, and Bobtail*. Harper. pp. 519. \$5.00.

Nowinson, Richard, and Potter, Ruth T., eds., *Who's Who in United States Politics, and, American Political Almanac*. Macmillan. pp. 992. \$25.00.

*O'Neill, James M., *Catholicism and American Freedom*. Harper. pp. 299. \$3.50.

Osborne, Harold, *Indians of the Andes*. Harvard. pp. 279. \$4.50.

Powell, Phillip W., *Soldiers, Indians, and Silver*. Univ. of Calif. Press. pp. 326. \$4.50.

Ramsay, R.L., *Our Storehouse of Missouri Place Names*. Missouri Handbook two; Univ. of Mo. Bulletin.

This booklet, the result of a project of several years of study, contains accurate information of importance for the study of Missouri history.

Rosenman, Samuel I., *Working with Roosevelt*. Harper. pp. 574. \$6.00.

*Schauinger, Joseph H., *Cathedrals in the Wilderness*. Bruce. pp. 347. \$4.00.

Seltzer, Leon E. et al., *The Columbia Lippincott Gazetteer of the World*. Columbia Univ. Press. pp. 2158. \$50.00.

Studenski, Paul, and Krooss, Herman E., *Financial History of the United States*. McGraw-Hill. pp. 538. \$6.50.

Wallace, Ernest, and Hoebel, Edward A., *The Comanches, Lords of the South Plains*. Univ. of Okla. Press. pp. 398. \$5.00.

Wilcox, Francis O., and Kalijarir, Thorstoen V., comps., *Recent American Foreign Policy*. Appleton-Century-Crofts. pp. 945. \$6.50.

*Wish, Harvey, *Society and Thought in Modern America*. Longmans. pp. 630. \$5.00 (Text ed.).

Wittke, Carl Frederick, *Refugees of Revolution*. Univ. of Pa. Press. pp. 393. \$6.00.

SAINT LOUIS UNIVERSITY

A Jesuit Institution

Founded 1818



"Democracy is built upon the
bedrock of Christian education..."

CONSTITUENT SCHOOLS

Labor College
School of Law
Graduate School
School of Divinity
School of Nursing
School of Dentistry
School of Medicine
Institute of Technology
School of Social Service
Institute of Social Science
College of Arts and Sciences
College of Philosophy and Letters
School of Commerce and Finance
Parks College of Aeronautical Technology

CORPORATE COLLEGES

Webster College
Maryville College
Fontbonne College
St. Mary's Junior College
Notre Dame Junior College

Saint Louis University owns and operates

Radio Station WEW

Saint Louis 3

Missouri